137

DATE LABEL

8/7/69	26 JUL 1972	25 APR 1987	31/12

Call No. 376.P36C Date.....

Account No. 954

J. & K. UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

This book should be returned on or before the last stamped a
An overdue charges of 6 nP. will be levied for each day. The b
kept beyond that day.

COEDUCATION

COEDUCATION

IN ITS HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL SETTING

L. B. PEKIN

THE HOGARTH PRESS
37 MECKLENBURGH SQUARE
LONDON, W.C.1
1939

ALLAMA IQBAL LIBRARY
954

First Published 1939

JAMMU & KASHMIR UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
No. 954
Date 6.4.1957
SRINAGAR

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE GARDEN CITY PRESS LTD.
AT LETCHWORTH, HERTFORDSHIRE.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Problem of Coeducation	7
II.	Physical Differences between the Sexes	19
III.	Intellectual Differences between the Sexes	35
IV.	Psychological Differences between the Sexes	51
V.	Historical Survey of Coeducation	62
VI.	Nineteenth-century Changes in Education	77
VII.	The Rise of Coeducation in England	91
VIII.	The New School	112
IX.	Coeducation in Other Countries	130
X.	Objections and Advantages Considered	151
XI.	Coeducation and Sex	170
XII.	Coeducation in the New School	186
Appendix I.	Some Private Coeducational Schools	205
Appendix II.	Bibliography	207

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM OF COEDUCATION

Some two thousand three hundred years ago Plato wrote to this effect: "Let us come to an understanding about the nature of woman; is she capable of sharing either wholly or partially in the actions of men, or not at all?"[1] This question, like most questions that Plato asked, is of fundamental importance, not only for education but for the whole structure of human society; and, like most of the questions he asked, it has not yet been satisfactorily answered. The striking conclusion to which every investigator of coeducation must be brought, is that on the whole mankind has not been particularly interested in Plato's question. Clearly it vitally affects educational policy: whether girls and boys are to be brought up together, or separately, is certainly not a matter of indifference, either to parents or to teachers. You have only to mention the word coeducation among any group of people, professional or lay, who may be keenly discussing the upbringing of children, to have immediate proof of this. Many of those who believe in it, do so passionately; many of those who disapprove, do so with violence. If

[1] *Republic*, V, 453.

education has any effect on human life at all—and there is remarkable unanimity among philosophers, prophets, saints and sages, to say nothing of less highly gifted people, that it has a profound effect—then, surely, it is a matter of some moment whether boys and girls are to have the same kind of education, and if so, whether they are to share it. Plato, still the greatest educationist that the Western world has known, wrote carefully and wisely on the subject in the *Republic* and the *Laws*; but after Plato there is what one must regard as an astonishing silence on the part of writers on education, which remains almost unbroken for the better part of twenty-two centuries, until Mary Wollstonecraft raises the point again. You may look through all the thousands of pages in the classical treatises on education since Plato's day—in Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, in Elyot's *Governour*, in the Jesuits' *Ratio Studiorum*, in Ascham's *Scholemaster*, in Milton's *Tractate on Education*, in Locke's *Thoughts concerning Education*, in Rousseau's *Émile*, in Pestalozzi's *Wie Gertrud ihre Kinder lehrt*, in Herbart's *Allgemeine Pädagogik*, in Froebel's *Menschenerziehung* or in Herbert Spencer's *Education*—and find no serious discussion of the matter at all, if indeed the education of girls receives so much as a passing mention. Yet all these books had, in their time, a far-reaching influence upon educational policy; some of them permanently affected men's whole approach to the bringing up of children. Rousseau does, to be sure, refer to the education of girls, but it is only to remark that "a woman of

culture is the plague of her husband, her children, her family, her servants—everybody." Like every romantic idealizer of women, Rousseau really felt for the other sex a thorough-going contempt; it comes out clearly in his portrait of Émile's Sophy, and the sort of upbringing that is to fit her to be his bride. The solitary exception in this history of the indifference of the classical theorists to women's education is the Moravian philosopher Comenius (Johann Komensky), whose *Didactica Magna* (1630) warmly advocated public schools for girls. Comenius was ahead of his age in many ways: among other things, he believed that it might be permissible to make learning pleasant. He preached education for all classes, rich and poor alike, and the breaking down of barriers between the classroom and the life of the world outside. But, though he intended girls to go to school, it is by no means certain that he intended them to share the school life of boys, though it remains at least a possibility.

The general literature of education is of vast extent; that concerning the coeducation of the sexes is comparatively exiguous. Some histories of education do not refer to the subject at all; in the four hundred pages of Adams' well-known *Evolution of Educational Theory*[1] it receives a single mention, when the author, in speaking of the French pioneer Edmond Demolins, remarks in horrified parenthesis that " he has gone to great lengths but he has drawn the line at coeducation." In their recently published

[1] John Adams: *Evolution of Educational Theory* (Macmillan), 1922.

pamphlet *Education Today—and Tomorrow* (surely a sufficiently comprehensive title) two extremely intelligent and socially sensitive ex-schoolmasters do not consider the subject worth discussing, and confine themselves to a suggestion that the proper type of school for the years between seven and eleven is "probably coeducational."[1] Yet they are acutely aware of the connection between education and the politico-social structure of a society; they look forward to the establishment of a democracy in Britain on a socialist basis; and they must know that one of the first acts of the Socialist revolution in Russia was to establish coeducation throughout the entire territory of the U.S.S.R., as one of the first acts of Nazi government in Germany was to abolish it. It is doubtful whether coeducation officially exists even today as a separate topic for serious discussion; the enquirer in the British Museum's subject index of books is met with the direction: "Coeducation: see Female Education." But coeducation and female education are not at all the same thing. Some States have taken official and intelligent cognizance of the subject; but not our own State, though in point of fact it is in Great Britain that the most important pioneer work in coeducation has been done. In 1916 a Royal Commission considered the problem of venereal disease in this country. It might be supposed that syphilis, which has been endemic in Britain since

[1] W. H. Auden and T. C. Worsley: *Education Today—and Tomorrow* (Hogarth Press), 1939.

the year 1497, which affects at least ten per cent. of the whole population in large cities, and ranks third or fourth among the " killing diseases," would have some connection in the official mind with the question of education. So it had; but not with coeducation. Both syphilis and gonorrhoea are contracted solely through sexual congress; sexual congress is a cardinal feature in the mutual relations of young women and men; their mutual relations are bound to be enormously influenced by the extent to which they learn to understand and respect each other during childhood and adolescence; but of the 22,296 questions asked by the Commissioners of numerous expert witnesses,[1] including teachers, not one referred to coeducation, whose central purpose it is to assure a right relationship between the sexes. The Commissioners claimed to consider all the causes of venereal disease and to listen to suggestions for their removal, and they rightly held that education was the primary issue; but though they were begged to tackle the subject of coeducation, they refused, pleading the too great scope of the question and the need for a speedy report.

The Board of Education might be expected to possess some facts, even if it had no theories, about coeducation; but they are extraordinarily difficult to come by. None of the nineteen statutes listed in its publications refers to the matter; the twenty-eight volumes of Special Reports on Educational Subjects,

[1] *Report of the Royal Commission on Venereal Diseases* (H.M. Stationery Office), 1916.

though they deal most satisfyingly with such things as the educational systems of Basutoland, Fiji and the Seychelles, have anything to say about co-education—also an educational subject not without importance. Among their 113 educational pamphlets, which include within their scope such topics as full-time schools for bakers and confectioners, and the botany garden of James Allen's Girls' School at Dulwich—whatever one may say of the Board, it cannot be held to take too narrowly blinkered a view of its advisory functions—we do not find one to consider whether boys and girls should be brought up together. Nor do the 363 reports, regulations, memoranda, circulars and schemes (embracing almost every conceivable subject from teachers' superannuation in Malta, and temperature-entropy diagrams for water-steam, to the interim report of the committee on adenoids and enlarged tonsils) give the dogged enquirer any further help. It is not suggested that our children's enlarged tonsils have not their importance: they have. But so has the whole manner of their upbringing, whether segregated or shared. Nor is it suggested that the Board is an obscurantist body: it is by no means unenlightened both in policy and aims, and may fairly be said to be well in advance of the general level of educational practice in the country. But owing to its peculiar constitutional position, there is a great deal about British education that it simply does not know. It does not know, for instance, how many private schools there are, but puts the number at

"perhaps 10,000," containing "about 400,000 pupils of all ages"; and of these 10,000 schools, exerting between them a profound influence upon the minds of the privileged classes of this country, only 1,300 have ever been inspected, and only 600 (or less than one in fifteen) have periodical inspection.[1] This appears to be a serious gap in the educational system of a people that is struggling to lay the foundations of a genuine democracy; and the Board's lack of interest in coeducation is surely another. It would not be true to suggest that they have been deliberately hostile to it; individual inspectors have often declared themselves favourably impressed by the work being done at pioneer coeducational schools, but they have not troubled to say so other than privately. There have been no official pronouncements, only the undeviating official policy: again and again the wishes of local education authorities have been overruled, when they have asked for a mixed school. Coeducation is faced with the further difficulty of the hostility of headmistresses, who find their status lowered when a man becomes principal of a mixed school. It is not, therefore, surprising to learn that the Association of Headmistresses is firmly opposed to coeducation; and since it numbers 500, representing a school population of some 150,000 girls, its influence is considerable. (Assistant mistresses, on the other hand, apparently prefer to serve under a man, and the

[1] *Report of the Departmental Committee on Private Schools* (H.M. Stationery Office), 1932.

Assistant Mistresses' Association has for some while been friendly disposed towards coeducation.) Public schoolmasters—both headmasters and assistant masters—and in particular the anti-feminist National Association of Schoolmasters are, as might be expected, not sympathetic; though even among these there have been some notable converts. In a single one of its important publications[1] the Board of Education has not been able to refrain from all mention of coeducation, though even on that occasion it did its best, and refused to admit the subject within its terms of reference, as being " not relevant." It was, of course, supremely relevant; and in spite of themselves the Consultative Committee make, in the course of an extremely interesting report, some important statements upon the bringing up of girls and boys together, which shall be quoted later here.

Now, if all this official indifference, lack of sympathy or downright opposition on the part of official bodies were based on well-informed policy, it would be understandable enough. But it is not merely ill-informed, it is practically not informed at all. The greatest of English coeducational pioneers, J. H. Badley, wrote in 1903: " Even on the physical side there is as yet very little agreement as to the difference of treatment necessitated by differences of bodily structure; and when we come to deal with differences of mental and moral structure . . . we are still in the dark, guided mainly by prejudice and convention. For until we

[1] *Report on Differentiation of Curricula*, see p. 38 footnote.

have exposed both sexes to similar conditions, we cannot tell what differences are inherent and unalterable and what merely the resultants of a different upbringing." [1] That is still true: almost everybody is in the dark about coeducation. The only public body that has the means—as it certainly has the duty—of finding out the facts, remains obstinately disinclined to do so; and the result is that there has never been any impartial scientific investigation on the subject. There is any amount of opinion, but precious little evidence. And yet there are more than twenty boarding schools in England alone which take boys and girls from an early age to university entrance, and many others with a narrower age range. Half of them are twenty years old, and a few have been established for more than thirty years. These schools may be doing a great service, or a great disservice, to some of the nation's children. If the former, why are they not commended? If the latter, why are they not condemned? They do not want to work in secret: they are most anxious to have the basis of their educational beliefs carefully and rationally examined. They admit that they are working on a hypothesis that has, so far, not been completely verified—for coeducation is certainly an experiment. These schools are trying to discover where and how far differences of treatment are necessary for boys and girls at the same school, so that their conclusions may be based on actual experience, and are not *a priori*.

[1] From an essay in A. Woods' *Coeducation*—see bibliography.

They are attempting to work out a common tradition for girls and boys in school life, which they believe will be of real value for the adult relationship between the sexes and of real importance for the democratic basis of society. Their problem is not a simple one: it is at least threefold. There is the biological question, the differences between the sexes in physical character and rate of development; the practical question, how far intellectual pursuits and ordinary school activities may suitably be shared; and the psychological question—clearly the most important—of the mutual influence of boys and girls.

Everybody admits the beneficial effects of co-education upon little children; it is at adolescence that the doubts begin to arise, because then children grow "so different." No upholder of coeducation would deny the existence of this difference; in it lies the chief interest and reward of his work. But he is entitled to ask his critics to consider how far the difference is the outcome of conventional treatment. That the physical differences between the sexes are profound and far-reaching is obvious—though it is by no means obvious that they call for different, or segregated, educational treatment. Of the intellectual and psychological differences between girls and boys, most teachers are still very ignorant; a great deal more experience and investigation is necessary before any final conclusions can be formed. That boys differ from girls is as patent as that boys differ from boys, and girls from girls; but it cannot be

denied that between the sexes there is much more similarity than difference. Is this similarity sufficient to warrant their being brought up together? Co-education means nothing less than the upbringing of girls and boys from infancy to adult life, under the guidance of older people who trust them, sharing most intellectual and many physical pursuits, and free to enjoy their leisure in each others' company. And those who practise it are probably agreed in holding that this alone is genuine education. Of course boys and girls can be taught, and extremely well taught, in separate schools; the question is, can they be educated apart from each other? But it is necessary first to attempt an answer to Plato's question. If we can discover what are the essential physical, intellectual and psychological differences between the sexes, and particularly between adolescent girls and boys, we shall at least have some factual foundation for our educational conclusions.

In an eloquent preface to the sixth edition of his monumental study of human secondary sexual characteristics,[1] Havelock Ellis makes a plea for that balanced and unprejudiced approach to the subject which most people find it very difficult to achieve. In comparing the capabilities of the sexes, almost every investigator is searching not for truths, but for conclusions comfortable to himself. There are enthusiastic feminists who indignantly reject the soundly tested hypothesis concerning the wider variational tendency in the male, because they resent

[1] Havelock Ellis: *Man and Woman* (A. & C. Black), 1930.

the apparent limitation placed on the congenital possibilities of women. There are those who imagine that because external and artificial sexual differences are due to tradition and circumstance, therefore the more organic sexual differences are equally superficial, and probably accounted for entirely by difference in education. There are the people who believe that if, on the average, the incidence of variations is rather more on the male than on the female sex, girls should therefore be educated within a more limited range than boys. There are others who suppose that the comparative infrequency of genius in women has been due to lack of favourable opportunity (though the same claim on behalf of feminine talent may be well enough founded). All these people have simply wandered off into aimless side-tracks, because they are afraid of where open-eyed investigation will lead them. We shall now proceed to consider what are the known facts concerning the physical differences between the sexes, and later what opinions and theories there are concerning their intellectual and psychological differences.

CHAPTER II

PHYSICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SEXES

Growth and proportions of the body. At birth, male infants are rather heavier and somewhat taller than female infants, and their chest girth is greater. During the early years of life boys appear to keep ahead in general physical growth, which is in both sexes rapid for the first two years and considerably slower during the third and fourth. But, for a period of several years during the development of puberty, girls of European race are both heavier and taller than boys of the same age. Up till $11\frac{1}{2}$ boys are heavier; then girls take the lead till about $13\frac{1}{2}$ (their average weight being 90 lb. to the boy's 83 lb.). Then the boy overtakes the girl, until equality of weight is reached at $15\frac{1}{2}$; and by 16 the boy is 2 lb. ahead (his average weight being 111 lb. to the girl's 109 lb.). The boy is taller up to 11 years, when the average heights of the sexes are the same (53·6 in.). After that the girl takes the lead, and at $13\frac{1}{2}$ is taller by 1 in.; she then begins to lose, and at 16 the boy is nearly 2 in. taller (his average height being 64·2 in. to the girl's 62·2 in.). The acceleration in the growth of girls between 10 and 15 appears to be coincident with a retardation in the growth of boys. After 15 the boy

takes the lead in height, which the girl has held for some three years, and reaches his full stature at 23. Girls, on the other hand, grow very slowly after the age of 16, and reach their full stature at 20. The year of most active growth appears in boys to be the sixteenth, and in girls the thirteenth; this period is preceded by one of marked delay in growth, reaching a maximum in about the eleventh year in boys and the tenth in girls. (These figures, and all that follow, apply accurately only to children in the United Kingdom; the rates of growth in, for instance, Sweden are considerably different.) There is no reason to accept any relation between height and intelligence.

Puberty. The evolution in puberty is more precocious in girls than in boys, being both begun and completed at an earlier age. Among London children the average onset of puberty occurs at 14-2 for girls, and 14-10 for boys. But since there is little deviation among boys, and a great deal among girls, the figures quoted must be taken with caution. The development of puberty is, in any case, considerably influenced by nourishment and general hygiene—that is to say, by the social class to which the child belongs.

Structure of the body. In woman there is a greater relative development of the abdominal organs as compared with the thoracic organs; she accumulates in her system incompletely oxidized material ready for impregnation or lactation, and when not otherwise utilized or integrated it forms adipose tissue.

Thus women possess a larger amount than men of comparatively non-vital tissue. Relatively to the total height, the head is longer in women than in men, the neck shorter, the trunk longer, and the legs and arms shorter. A woman's thigh is notably shorter than a man's; it is thicker, and set at a different angle, its marked inward inclination often giving the appearance of knock-knee, and compelling the woman to run by alternate semi-circular rotations of the legs. In their great toes and thumbs women are less developed than men; a long great toe and a long thumb are recent acquirements of the race, and they are relatively longer in men. On the other hand, by her short arms woman is further removed than man from the ape and the savage, among whom the fore-arm especially is very long.

Pelvis. Broadly it may be said that the physical differences between men and women extend not only to general proportions and laws of growth but to each part of the body taken separately. Special mention should be made of the pelvis and the skull, which hold respectively the primary organs of sex and the chief nervous centres. That the condition and growth of the sexual organs profoundly affect the mental states of their possessor is well known, though all the physiological processes are by no means fully understood. The adaptation of the pelvis, during the course of evolution, to the erect position has involved a very delicate adjustment of physical forces; and as this adjustment must be carried to its

highest point in woman, the pelvis of women is in many respects more highly developed than that of men, which retains more animal-like characteristics. The sexual differences in the pelvis are already marked as soon as the bones of the embryo begin to ossify, in the fourth month or even earlier; thus during foetal life the essentially sexual characteristics are as well defined as they are in adult forms. Verticality of the spine is in direct ratio with evolution and nutrition, and in this respect woman is nearer to the infantile condition than man, since she tends to tilt the head forward and the pelvis back, and to keep her spine curved. (If, altogether, woman's body seems to be somewhat more reminiscent of the quadrupedal posture than man's, she has excellent reasons for it, since the erect position has comparatively slight effect on man's sexual organs, while it tends very seriously to affect those of the woman, and enormously interferes with the maternal functions. The shape of her pelvis is the result of a compromise between two forms—one for support, the other for ease in delivery. It is necessary for the stability of the body and the proper support of the organs that the pelvis should be tough, and its inner channel small; on the other hand, for the higher evolution of the race it is necessary for the bony girdle to be rendered less stable by the increased size of the outlet, to permit the birth of large-headed children.)

Skull. Most craniologists have declared that there are no sexual differences in the skull except size.

But though there is no one constant sexual character in the skull, there are a few characters which, taken together, do unmistakably indicate its sex. Men's brows overhang more than women's, and all the muscular prominences in the skull are better marked in men. Women's skulls are relatively flatter at the top, and relatively shallower than those of men; and they show a greater average degree of brachycephaly. (The child is strikingly brachycephalic, and women approximate to the child type more closely than do men.) The evolutional tendency of the face is to become smaller while the skull becomes larger, and woman's face compared to her relatively large head is usually stated to be smaller than man's. There is a certain amount of parallelism between face growth and stature growth, alike in the tendency to periods of retarded growth, in the temporary relative predominance of girls at puberty, and in the more protracted growth in man. In girls the face ceases to grow at seventeen, while in boys it is still growing at eighteen and probably continues to grow after that. Women's eyes seem to be generally larger and more prominent than men's, but this effect is for the most part apparent only, and is chiefly due to the lower arching of the bony ridges above the eyes in men. Women are more prognathous than men, as children are than adults, and apes than human beings; on the other hand they show a higher degree of evolution than men by the relatively smaller weight of their jaws. Women's teeth tend, for this reason, to be cramped. First dentition begins earlier in girls than

in boys, the average difference between the sexes in this respect being thirty-one days; and there is a corresponding difference in the case of the permanent teeth. Wisdom teeth are also more precocious in women. But while the jaws of civilized women tend to be unduly small, there is reason to think that their teeth have remained relatively and even absolutely larger than those of men.

Cranial capacity. Cranial capacity is considerably greater in men than in women, but since their body weight is also considerably greater, this result is not surprising, and it may be held that the cranial capacity of women is relatively greater than that of men. In any case, cranial capacity is not an exact indication of brain size, and it is even more useless to attempt to measure brain size by the external size of the skull, since man's skull is thicker than woman's. In the earlier days of craniology it used to be asserted that the frontal regions of the skull, regarded as the " nobler " regions, were more developed in men than in women. But there is no reason for supposing that they are thus more developed, still less that they harbour any particularly noble qualities. On the whole, there is no valid ground for concluding that the skull of one sex is morphologically superior to that of the other. In such clearly marked differences as there are, man approaches the simian and woman the infantile type.

The brain. " The history of opinion regarding cerebral sexual difference," writes Havelock Ellis, " forms a painful page in scientific annals. It is full

of prejudices, assumptions, fallacies, over-hasty generalizations. The unscientific have had a predilection for this subject; and men of science seem to have lost the scientific spirit when they approached the study of its seat." [1] The facts are as follows: in European races at any rate, the absolute weight of the brain in man is considerably greater than in woman. But it is much more difficult to determine whether men's brains are relatively larger, for we have first to decide to what we are going to compare the brain. It is possible to take height, or better the height of the body only; and it is still found that, relatively to stature, men possess heavier brains than women. (Man's brain weight is to woman's as 100 to 90; the average stature of men to women in England is as 100 to 93; so that, taking stature into account, men have a slight but distinct excess of brain—amounting to a little over an ounce—over women.) But that is not a very accurate method of estimation, for men are not only taller than women, but larger also. Only a single measurement—the girth of the thighs—is almost constantly larger in women. A more logical method is to consider differences in brain weight in accordance with their ratio to body weight; and women are found thus to possess brains of about the same size, or possibly slightly larger, than men's. It must still be remembered that we are comparing here a stable element with an extremely unstable one; lazy, well-to-do people weigh more than the

[1] *Man and Woman*, from which most of the matter in this discussion has been compiled.

inmates of a workhouse, and a well-fed individual dying after a wasting disease will appear to possess a relatively much larger brain than if he had died in his prime. This factor may well be held to invalidate the whole process of measurement, so that the two most usual methods of estimating the sexual proportions of brain mass—the ratio to body height and the ratio to body weight—are equally erroneous. But when all possible error has been eliminated, it is probably true that women possess a relatively larger mass of nervous tissue than men; how far this is advantageous to them is doubtful—a relatively large brain not rooted in a good muscular foundation may be liable to function unsteadily. (It is worthy of note that epileptics have relatively large brains.) Some men of genius have possessed brains that were enormously large, both absolutely and relatively; but the largest recorded brain belonged to a completely undistinguished individual. The second largest was the brain of an imbecile, while the third was Turgenev's; the two next in weight belonged to common labourers, and the sixth to the celebrated zoologist Cuvier.

Growth of the brain. At birth, the boy's brain is larger than the girl's, and in both sexes it grows very rapidly during the first few years. At the age of three months the brain is about a fifth part of the whole weight of the body, whereas in the adult it is only a thirty-third part. By the age of six months the absolute weight of the brain has doubled in girls, and nearly doubled in boys; by the age of seven it has

quadrupled in girls, and before the age of fourteen it has quadrupled in boys. The precocity of the female brain is thus extremely marked: a girl between the ages of four and seven has already gained 92 per cent. of her final brain weight, while a boy of the same age has only reached 83 per cent. After seven the girl's brain grows very little, and practically ceases to grow at the age of twenty, while the man's brain does not reach its maximum size until after thirty years of age. Contrary to long-accepted opinion, women have some superiority over men in the frontal lobes of the brain; but, as has been pointed out already, there is no ground for assigning any specially exalted functions to this portion, though "professors" on seaside piers will no doubt long continue to give pleasure to clients and their fiancées by encouraging them to think otherwise. In point of fact, the frontal region is, relatively, very considerably developed in the anthropoidal apes, whose intellectual processes and moral stature have not been widely admired. Women's brain receives a proportionately larger blood supply than men's, so that they do not suffer from the comparative poverty which characterizes their blood. To sum up: it is found that men possess no relative superiority of brain mass; in so far as that exists, it is on women's side; but in any case it implies no intellectual superiority, being merely characteristic of short people and infants.

The senses. In tactile sensibility women are in general superior to men. Girls and women are at all

ages more sensitive to pain than boys and men, the average difference between the sexes continuing about the same up to the age of thirteen; after that age girls appear to remain almost stationary, retaining their youthful sensibility, while boys progressively lose theirs. But there are numerous findings which show that women are less affected by pain and suffering than men; and they commonly show a greater degree of disvulnerability (quick repair of wounds and comparative freedom from ill consequences after severe injuries), which is a characteristic of savages and lower animals. They appear, for instance, to bear amputation better than men; their resistance to death is shown not only at birth by female infants, but in old age by the greater longevity of women. Delicacy of perception in the sense of smell seems to be more strongly marked among men than women. Certain investigators have found that olfactory sensibility is both greater and more precocious in small girls than in boys, but it appears to decrease with age, so that at the age of six the two sexes are practically equal. Since women are not employed in such occupations as tea tasting, which require specially delicate discrimination, and are rarely good connoisseurs of wine, it might be assumed that their sense of taste is not so highly developed as men's. But such does not appear to be the case: accurate investigations have credited them with a more delicate sense of taste—though it has been held that male habits of smoking and drinking have caused a degeneration in originally superior

gustatory apparatus. Deafness is decidedly more common in men than in women; but the evidence concerning sexual differences in sensitiveness to sound during health is inconclusive. Interest in music appears to be much greater in girls than in boys. Blindness in England is much more common among males than among females at all ages up to seventy-five; the preponderance of women after this age is due simply to their greater longevity. But the excess of males may be due to greater liability to occupational accidents, and it does not appear that minor defects of sight are more common among men. In general, women would seem to be liable to the slight disturbances of eyesight which are peculiarly associated with civilization, while men are probably more liable to serious eye defects. In colour perception women are inferior to men in range of sensation, but within the limits of the ordinary range common to both sexes they have perhaps slightly greater powers of discrimination. Colour blindness is at least ten times more frequent in men than in women; and it is curious to note that Jews and Quakers are more subject to colour blindness than the rest of the population. To sum up, the balance of advantage in sensibility is certainly on the side of woman, though it is less emphatically so than popular notions would suggest. Sensibility (precision and intensity of perception of stimulus) is not at all the same thing as affectability (readiness of motor response to stimulus), in which women certainly lag considerably behind men.

Motion. Women everywhere reveal less capacity for motor energy than men, and less delight in its exercise. Except at that period during the evolution of puberty when girls are in most respects ahead of boys, they remain, both in vital capacity and muscular power, considerably behind them. Boys can carry about one-third more than girls; and while a man can carry about double his own weight, a woman can carry only about half hers. There is also a marked inferiority in the respiratory system in women. Not only are their muscles smaller and their muscular energy less, but the joints are decidedly smaller; so that the muscular strength of a man is equal to one-half again that of a woman. In reaction to a given signal, boys are rather quicker than girls at all ages from six to seventeen; but when discrimination and choice are involved in addition to simple reaction, the sexual difference almost disappears. Both in the blood of women and in their muscles there is more water than in those of men. But when women are working at their own natural level of energy, they tire less quickly than men do when working at their own natural level. In manual dexterity women appear, contrary to the general belief, to be inferior, though they are quicker to make new muscular co-ordinations.

Blood. The blood of men, containing less water and more red corpuscles, is consequently of a higher specific gravity than that of women; and it contains considerably more haemoglobin, since women store the iron contained in the haemoglobin in their

maternal organs, even before the first conception, in readiness for the supply of the foetus through the placental circulation. This deficiency of haemoglobin in a girl's blood, especially after puberty when it first becomes marked, makes her more easily tired and more liable to anaemia. In old women the specific gravity of the blood rises again, which may be a factor in their greater longevity.

Respiration. Boys are at all ages superior to girls in lung capacity, this being at thirteen the only respect in which they surpass them. It is well known that man's breathing is normally abdominal, and woman's costal; but it appears that this breathing from the chest in woman is not a sexual secondary characteristic, being chiefly due to the effects of woman's conventional dress, which by constricting the action of the diaphragm has in the course of many ages both diminished diaphragmatic action and injured the abdominal viscera. Thus, women everywhere suffer more from gall-stones than do men; and the mortality of girls from phthisis up to the age of twenty exceeds that of boys, in sexual ratio to the population, by as much as 30 per cent. Those parents who repress the impulse of small girls to climb trees are doing a foolish thing, for it is precisely the kind of exercise they need to develop their chests.

Viscera. The thyroid gland, which is known to be closely associated with the sexual system, is absolutely larger in women than in men, and nearly all diseases connected with it, such as goitre and cretinism, are more common among women. The heart, at an

early age, is as large in the female as in the male, or even larger; but from the age of twenty it stays about two ounces smaller. The stomach is relatively larger in women than in men. On the whole, it may be said that the thoracic organs predominate slightly in men, and the abdominal in women.

Functional periodicity in women. While a man may be said to live on a plane, a woman always lives on the upward or downward slopes of a curve. The physiological and psychological interactions of menstruation have so far been insufficiently studied, but it is certain that intellectual vigour, general suggestibility and profound changes of mood are involved in the physical disturbance. It is probable that the functions of all the senses in woman show a similar monthly rhythm. Criminal statistics show that offences by women are almost invariably committed during the menstrual period.

Hypnotic phenomena. Sleep-walking appears to be common among women, and they are more easily hypnotizable than men. (It may be worth noting that the ancient oracles usually emanated from women, while in the Middle Ages the proportion of witches to wizards was estimated at not less than fifty to one.) Women appear also to dream more than men; and their greater susceptibility to neurasthenia and hysteria is well known. They respond, in fact, more readily than men to most stimuli, psychic or physical. They blush more easily, are more ticklish, cry more easily, become more easily irascible.

Variational tendency in men. There is greater general variability in the male sex; and if it were not for the powerful levelling factor of the difficulty of male birth—still-born children are much more frequently boys than girls—their comparative abnormality would probably be greater than it is. Nearly every abnormality is more frequent among boys than girls: cleft palates, hare lips, club feet, supernumary digits, transposition of viscera, and many others. Left-handedness is twice as common in men as in women; male albinos, deaf-mutes and imbeciles are more common than female, as are mathematical prodigies. Most sexual perversions are more common among men. But if men furnish the world with most of its idiots, they also provide most of its geniuses; for genius must be regarded as an organic congenital abnormality. Though this special quality is by no means confined to one sex, yet it has all through history been predominantly associated with one sex; and it is only a natural aspect of an acknowledged zoological fact—the greater variability of the male.

It may be thought that we have wandered far from our educational theme, but it is necessary to compare very carefully the male and female beings, simply as physical organisms, if we are to come to right conclusions about the possibility, or desirability, of bringing them up together. The outward physical organization of schools is going to have an important influence on them; and if this is less important than the intellectual influence of their education, which in its turn is less important than the psychological or

spiritual influence, it is nevertheless worthy of some consideration. We have seen that male and female are, physically speaking, variations upon the same theme: they are perfectly poised, at every point different and at all points equivalent. There is no physical reason why boys should be anxious to do everything that girls do, or girls be anxious to do everything that boys do; nor is there anything in properly conducted coeducation which should force either sex in this way. But there is likewise no physical reason why each sex should not be absolutely free to develop all the possibilities within its own proper nature; and there is a good deal in segregated education which thwarts such development, as there is much in coeducation which is well designed to foster it. Physically, each sex is incomplete without the other: the powers and aptitudes of girls and boys respectively are both needed to create and to manage a common society.

CHAPTER III

INTELLECTUAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SEXES

So far, in considering the physical differences between men and women, we have been dealing for the most part with scientifically ascertained fact. Some of the statistics contained in the previous chapter were categorical and perhaps over-simplified; but on the whole the conclusions set forth are based on carefully conducted research. We now move into the realm of conjecture and all-too-easy generalization, where it is extraordinarily difficult to be at the same time succinct and accurate. But the task of establishing the differences of intellectual equipment, and therefore of educable capacity, between girls and boys should not be shirked just because it is difficult. Both writer and reader will need to keep a careful rein upon their personal predilections, remembering that it is scarcely possible not to wish for, and therefore to discern, virtues in the particular sex to which they respectively happen to belong.

Many observers have found (this qualifying clause should be mentally inserted before most statements that follow in this chapter) that the feminine intellectual impulse tends towards the immediate

surroundings, the finished product, the ornamental, the individual and the concrete; while the masculine preference is for the more remote, the constructive, the useful, the general and the abstract. Perhaps that is only an elaborate way of saying what every-body knows, that women are more interested in people, and men in ideas. Girls appear to have superior powers of memorizing, though not always superior powers of retention in memory. In girls there is a general development in all kinds of memory about the age of twelve, but this uniformity is not marked in boys. When comparison is made between boys and girls of ten or eleven there is, on the whole, a very slight superiority of girls; between twelve and thirteen—when the general precocity of girls comes into play—they have a decided superiority, and only slightly lose their lead in later years. Buckle drew attention to women's tendency to start from ideas rather than from the patient collection of facts, but believed that their naturally fine and nimble minds were often irretrievably injured by " that preposter-ous system called their education."

Reference has already been made to the precocity of girls in physical growth; it applies also to their intelligence. Among children under the age of twelve, teachers commonly find the girls cleverer than the boys, though speaking generally, precocity of intelligence is not a good augury for intelligence in after-life. The mature feminine brain is notably incapable of effective abstract thought, which seems in women often to be marked by a certain docility

and receptiveness. Havelock Ellis finds that "even in trivial matters the average woman more easily accepts statements and opinions than a man, and in more serious matters she is prepared to die for a statement or an opinion, provided it is uttered with such authority and unction that her emotional nature is sufficiently thrilled." Women have been conspicuously indifferent to speculations conducted *sub specie aeternitatis*, and have contributed none of their sex to the number of metaphysicians of the first rank—which may be a criticism of women or of metaphysics, according as one chooses to look at it.

In pictorial and sculptural art only a few women have achieved honourable mention, and in the evolution of music they have played a very small part. The players of music have often been women; the makers of music—that most abstract of the arts—have nearly always been men. How far the ability to achieve eminence in these spheres depends upon the possession of a room of one's own, is a separate question altogether; we are discussing what has been, not what might or ought to have been. In fiction women are acknowledged to rank incomparably higher than in any other form of literary art, and they have equalled or excelled men in the arts of acting and dancing. There may be more than a grain of truth in the suggestion that the art impulse is of the nature of a male secondary sexual characteristic. Some people have sought the explanation of the small part played by women in art, and their defective sense for purely aesthetic beauty, in their less

keen sexual emotions; and certainly it is true that in women the sexual sphere is more extended than in men, and less energetic in its manifestations, whereas the male sexual instinct is a restless source of energy which overflows into all sorts of creative channels. But it is time to leave speculations that have often been no more than hazardous and uncertain, and return to the more circumscribed but solider field of educable capacity.

The evidence here has been well collected and set out in a Government publication already referred to.[1] The committee was a distinguished one, including such names as W. H. Hadow, Ernest Barker and R. H. Tawney, and its conclusions should be listened to with respect. Up to twelve years of age, it was found that there was little difference in the educable capacity of the sexes. In infants' schools sex differences in reasoning power are almost imperceptible; later, owing to a slight precocity in the ability to read and use words, girls appear to be slightly in advance of boys about the age of six or seven. Towards the age of ten, boys tend to outstrip girls; then with the onset of puberty girls again develop for a time far more rapidly than boys, although the boys overtake them again later on. In these years boys exhibit rather more independence of thought and greater facility in oral expression, while girls have greater facility in writing and are capable of more sustained

[1] *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Differentiation of Curricula for Boys and Girls respectively in Secondary Schools* (H.M. Stationery Office), 1923. The conclusions of this report have been copiously drawn from in the pages that follow.

effort. Boys are more methodical, less verbose and less diffuse; girls excel in attention to detail and desire for neatness in their work. Boys are readier than girls to work with their hands. Girls are more conventional and more responsible.

Between twelve and fourteen considerable changes occur. In the latter part of the period girls tend to lose the all-round lead which they previously held, and boys once more slowly reach, or even overtake, the level previously attained by the other sex. From the ages of thirteen to fifteen docility in girls decreases; there is an increase of self-consciousness and sensitiveness in both sexes, and girls frequently suffer from mental lethargy and consequent slovenliness in their work. But in virtue of their greater conscientiousness they still tend to take school work seriously, whereas boys are inclined to become idle and defiant. Many teachers have found the girls more passive and imitative at this stage, while the boys have more desire to reason things out.

Between fourteen and sixteen the tendency to mental lethargy is still observable in girls, who are found now to rely too much on memory and imitation, while boys begin to display an aptitude for subjects that allow of abstract treatment. Many witnesses observe that at this stage boys develop the power of reasoning in a notable degree, whereas girls develop more readily the capacity for criticism and appreciation. From fourteen to seventeen the interests of boys are more absorbed in the life of action and adventure, while those of girls are usually

concerned in the emotional and picturesque aspects of life. Since their feelings are now more easily moved, they can now more readily be swept away by group suggestion, or persuaded to overwork themselves in order to win the approbation of any-one they admire. Pressure on girls, in the opinion of most teachers, should be avoided during this period. After the age of fifteen the girl's development becomes slower, while the boy develops more rapidly both in body and in mind, until at the age of six-teen the average girl is about one year behind the average boy. (The Committee recommended that girls should, as a rule, be encouraged to take the First School Examination about a year later than boys.)

Much of the foregoing evidence is of a subjective character, and it cannot in the nature of things be exact, or exhaustive, or founded on a complete experience of both sexes. In particular it must be remembered that it proceeds mainly from teachers at segregated schools, and there is reason to think that sex differences which appear to such people ineradicable, are in fact minimized, or disappear altogether, when girls and boys are brought up together. Many generalizations have been made about the different capacities of the two sexes in learning different school subjects: it is said that girls are inferior all round in "performance," or that they are imitative while boys are creative, or that they are "no use at mathematics." Probably none of these sweeping statements is without foundation in

substance; but when we come to look at the actual results of examinations, the striking thing is how close the achievements of the two sexes are. An analysis of the results in the Cambridge Local examination, for instance, showed that boys obtained slightly higher marks in Mathematics, Chemistry, Physics, Latin, and to a lesser extent in Physical Geography, while girls had a slight lead in English Literature, English Composition, Botany, Geography, Oral French and Art. In other subjects there was no noticeable difference between their performances. The impression is general among teachers that boys excel in mathematical subjects, and girls in languages and literature, but examination results should be taken with considerable caution as an indication of natural capacity, since the time allotted to different subjects varies in girls' and boys' schools, and the most highly skilled teachers are probably unevenly distributed among the segregated schools. (It is likely that a better tradition of English teaching exists in girls' schools, while there is a relative lack of women teachers with high academic qualification for teaching Latin, Mathematics and Physics.) There is a great deal of investigation here that can be undertaken satisfactorily only by coeducational schools. It would be a very rash assertion, on the evidence so far set forth, to say that there is any real difference in the general educability of boys and girls, though there are certainly the makings of a case for such an assertion in the province of Mathematics and the exact sciences.

It may be worth considering the evidence regarding separate school subjects, though it must be borne in mind that it can make no claim either to comprehensiveness or to scientific accuracy.

Classics. Girls have a lower standard of attainment, which is probably largely, and possibly entirely, due to tradition.

Modern languages. Girls have here a higher general average of attainment, especially in oral work. Partly, no doubt, tradition is at work here also; but it should be remembered that girls usually have a better-trained ear and greater mimetic ability. From the point of view of a teacher at a coeducational school, boys' application and girls' quick perception make an admirable mixture.

English language and literature. The average achievement of girls is distinctly superior to that of boys; though here too, as in many other subjects, boys do the best work as well as the worst. Girls write compositions with more facility but greater wordiness. Boys are less articulate, but think more for themselves. The teacher at a coeducational school is thankful to have them together in one classroom; girls can help boys to "let themselves go", and express their feelings on paper, while boys can help girls realize that feeling as a touchstone of value in literature is not infallible.

History. Teachers' opinion inclines to the view that girls are superior here to boys, but examination results show little difference in achievement. Girls' work is in general more full of material, but unenterprising,

while boys show more signs of originality, freshness and variety. Temperamentally they probably approach the subject from a different angle, the interest of the girl centring on personalities rather than policies.

Geography. Girls appear to be more painstaking in this subject, and boys better at applying their knowledge.

Mathematics. As we have seen, girls' inferiority in this subject is not open to question. But it may be due, to some extent at least, to the teaching tradition in their segregated schools, to the widespread notion that Mathematics is unsuitable for girls, or to their knowledge that they are unlikely to need it for a career.

Science. The standard of girls' attainment is lower than that of boys. This may be partly due to teaching tradition; but it seems as though girls lack the attitude of scepticism and curiosity which gives the best approach to Natural Science. They show on the whole less power of grasping general principles. Girls noticeably excel at the biological sciences and Hygiene, in which they are helped by their greater diligence and neatness, and their superior descriptive powers. Boys excel them in experimental work, in initiative and in reasoning. The boy's tendency is to go ahead, and to use common sense and direct methods in solving a problem; the girl's attitude is more receptive, and her mental efforts more clumsy and roundabout. But the girl shows a better attention to detail and form in written work.

Music. Since much more time is devoted to this subject in girls' segregated schools than in boys' it is difficult to make satisfactory comparison. Opinion seems to be much divided. Girls up to twelve are said to make more rapid progress in instrumental music, and to show more technical ability, while boys show a stronger impulse to creative work. Boys show less desire than girls to perform on an instrument themselves. Cases of exceptional musical talent are most frequently found among boys, though this does not necessarily take the form of executive ability—great musicality and power of appreciation can exist without any desire to play at all. The breaking of boys' voices naturally affects their interest in one branch of this subject, and singing is perhaps the only subject in the school curriculum in which coeducation should not be applied—since it is unwise, from a technical point of view, to teach the sexes singing together.

Drawing. Up to the age of thirteen the two sexes appear to be equally equipped for this subject; after this time they pass through phases of artistic adolescence which are fundamentally different. Boys are said to be far more objective in their observation: they are interested in discovering the exact nature of things. The boy explores in certain directions only, according to his idiosyncrasy; but where he does explore, it is with great sympathy and imagination. His self-expression is the attempt to attain understanding of things foreign to himself. Left to herself, the girl finds out that what she already sees and

knows of the world has a personal interest and an influence over her which she proceeds to express. Girls appear to be more interested in colour, boys to possess more initiative in design. An examiner in Drawing for the Oxford and Cambridge Joint Board found that boys' work showed more observation, humour and sense of mechanical construction, while girls' work was characterized by more imagination and sense of colour and harmony.

The conclusions furnished by such evidence as the above need careful modification in the light of the actual history of girls' education in this country. As the Consultative Committee point out, this has already passed through two stages, and may now be entering on a third. Down to about the middle of the last century it was assumed that the education of girls—if they had any at all—must be different from that of boys because they belonged to the "weaker sex." This was the stage of difference based on inequality—and of educational inefficiency. Later the cause of efficiency was identified with that of equality, and girls' education entered the stage of identity based on equality. We are now able to see that equality of capacity does not demand identity of treatment. It is something to have proved—and it is reasonable to assert, on the evidence given, that we have sufficient proof—that girls and boys are equally educable; but it would be the greatest mistake to suppose that the interests of both sexes are best served by giving them identical curricula in segregated schools. The coeducational teacher will

feel that there are the strongest possible grounds here for teaching them together: their capacities and their weaknesses are complementary, and the proper balance between them can only be struck in a school where the needs of both are harmonized. The two sexes are each other's best education. It may be fitting to close this consideration of a report from which such full extract has been made, with the Committee's own conclusion: "Our enquiry has not imbued us with any conviction that there are clear and ascertained differences between the two sexes on which an educational policy may readily be based. We have encountered a number of facile generalizations about the mental differences between boys and girls; we have found few, if any, which we were able to accept. . . . Men and women have existed for centuries; but either sex is still a problem to the other—and, indeed, to itself; nor is there any third sex to discriminate dispassionately between the two. . . . In the meantime it is the part of wisdom neither to assume difference nor to postulate identity, but to leave the field free to both to show themselves."

In a fascinating study of educable capacity among young children on more scientific lines than the foregoing,[1] Cyril Burt comes to very similar conclusions. The experiences of so distinguished an investigator of child nature and intelligence may be worth briefly setting down. The results of tests taken, on the Binet-Simon scale and on the Burt scale, by a large

[1] Cyril Burt: *Mental and Scholastic Tests* (P. S. King & Son), 1927.

number of school children between the ages of five and fourteen, were as follows. In vocabulary and reading speed girls were ahead all along; in comprehension, boys were ahead from five to seven, girls from seven to fourteen. In spelling and dictation girls were very slightly ahead. In mental arithmetic girls were markedly behind, particularly in problems. In speed and quality of writing girls were ahead, particularly at the ages of ten and eleven. In drawing girls were behind till twelve, at thirteen the sexes were equal, and at fourteen boys were better. In speed of handwork the sexes were roughly equal, but in quality of handwork the boys were definitely better all along. In speed and quality of English composition the girls were easily ahead all along.

The Binet-Simon test of "general intellectual ability" placed girls ahead of boys at almost every age from five to fourteen, except at about ten, when boys appeared to make a spurt. But this superiority was a modest one: girls were advanced on an average by three-tenths of a year, attaining their maximum lead between the ages of six and seven. Possibly this result is due to the preponderance of literary and mental exercises throughout the range of the tests; a linguistic bias would naturally favour the more linguistic sex. In other tests—as in Burt's Reasoning Test—the differences are less consistently maintained, and the sexes pass and overlap each other the whole way from the seventh to the fourteenth year. As Burt says, boys and girls "play a sort of statistical leap-frog" throughout their school years,

and there is no clear evidence for any large innate sex differences either in mental or in educable capacities. There is considerable evidence that boys' intellectual ability deviates more from the mean than girls', which is yet another expression of the greater variability in the male.

In art, Burt finds an admitted difference in performance, but declares that the problem is circular—" difference in curricula [between girls' and boys' schools] is cited as the cause of difference in skill; difference in skill is urged as the reason for difference in curricula." He finds that girls have a keener eye for colour, but boys a steadier hand for form. Girls excel in delineating minute particulars, boys in conveying a general impression of the whole. Girls are cunning in conventional design, but show less vigour, less humour and less originality. (All of these conclusions strikingly confirm the testimony already quoted, given to the Board of Education Committee.) In handwork he observes a notable difference in tests which call for spontaneous invention of an original design: here boys are both quicker and more creative. In handwriting the girls are superior.

Among children of ordinary elementary schools, girls would appear to be inferior to boys in subtraction and division; in addition, and especially in multiplication, they are often superior—possibly because of the dependence of these latter tasks upon rote memory for tables, girls possessing almost invariably better memorizing powers. He finds girls

superior, too, in accuracy of reading, fluency, comprehension and expressiveness; this he attributes to the good use they make of books, newspapers and adult conversation heard in their homes. Girls are normally more voracious readers than boys.

This chapter is in danger of losing its direction in a series of nicely balanced Tacitean antitheses, but that difficulty is inherent in the nature of its subject —it does appear as if, for every particular intellectual advantage displayed by one sex, the other possessed some compensating power. It will scarcely be said that any valid reason has emerged why boys and girls should not be capable of sharing intellectual pursuits at school. It cannot be too often repeated that where fundamental intellectual differences are believed to exist between the sexes, they are so believed by teachers who have the opportunity of studying one sex alone. The evidence best worth listening to is that of the coeducational teacher, who sees in the very dissimilarity (not inequality) of girls and boys an extremely refreshing incentive to teaching. He may find that girls are more intuitive, and boys more logical; that girls are better at memorizing, and boys at concentrating; that girls are better at detail, and boys more critical; that girls are wordy and diffuse in written, and boys inferior at oral work—he may find these and a hundred other dissimilarities, or he may decide that all theorizing about their differences is sheer logomachy whose only effect is to bewilder, and that the theorists would be better employed actually teaching

ordinary children in each other's company. What he will certainly find is this: that the qualities of the two sexes apart, and of the two sexes together, are very different things. The pictures may be different, but together they give a vital stereoscopic effect. It was the opinion of Homer Lane, a great coeducationist and a great lover of children, that "the differences, physical and mental, between members of the same sex present difficulties greater than are caused by differences between the sexes." Human nature, after all, is greater than sex, and the coeducational teacher very quickly forgets theories and statistics about masculine and feminine "performance" in the consciousness that he has to deal with living children. Of the sexual differences—physical, intellectual and psychological—between boys and girls, the intellectual differences are certainly the least. The profoundest difference between them lies perhaps on the emotional side, and it is to this that we must now turn.

CHAPTER IV

PSYCHOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SEXES

Opinion among psychologists concerning coeducation is—like their opinion concerning most other things—sharply divided. Many psychologists are among its firmest supporters; but it would not be fair to pretend that there is not a school of psychological thought which regards coeducation with scepticism, if not with apprehension. This is the Freudian school, which has taught human beings the importance of the individual unconscious life. Actually, psycho-analysis (a term strictly reserved for the use of the methods of this school) has no ready-made educational solutions to offer, nor does it hold any brief for or against coeducation; it merely draws attention to the profound difference of the impulse life—an ungainly equivalent, but our only one, for the useful term *Triebleben*—in male and female, owing to the differing biological construction of the sexes and the differing relationship of girl and boy respectively to the parent. The protagonist of this form of criticism of coeducation is Barbara Low, who puts the case very clearly in her book *The Unconscious in Action*.[1]

[1] Barbara Low: *The Unconscious in Action; its influence upon education* (University of London Press), 1928.

She readily admits some arguments in favour of coeducation: the capacity of the female to equal male achievement in mental and, to a large extent, physical spheres; the complementary nature of the sexes; the advantages of the conjunction of masculine and feminine standards and methods among the adults managing the school; and the obviation of too great differentiation of treatment between the sexes, which notoriously leads to hostility. This might seem to form a very handsome tribute to coeducation as a method of upbringing; but Barbara Low asserts that these arguments still ignore the most dynamic factors in education, the unconscious ones. At this point the chief witness for the prosecution makes its appearance: this is the castration complex. The Freudian school holds that the situation (to be found in some degree in every human being) denoted by this term implies an unconscious sense of guilt connected with the sexual organs and their pleasurable functioning—most directly concerned with some form or other of masturbation—and with emotions directed against the parents' sexual activities.[1] This guilt sense is held to manifest itself on the conscious level, in both child and adult, through numerous forms of anxiety, such as a feeling that the sex organs are defective or weak, that the individual is physically ill-developed or lacking in some respect, that mental vigour is below par, that the individual has no will-power, no

[1] Much of the argument that follows is culled from a discussion on this point, initiated by Barbara Low, in *The New Era* of April 1937.

power to love or to win love. This school believes that some amount of such fear is to be found in every human being, since it is inevitably bound up with the classical Oedipus situation that holds so cardinal a position in psycho-analytical thought; so that only through a satisfactory resolving of this situation can the castration fears cease to inhibit sexual, emotional and mental development. The girl's sense of organ deprivation, it is held, develops into hostility against man and a man-made world, into excessive self-depreciation or its opposite, over-ambitious desire to rival the other sex; while the boy may be barred, by fears connected with guilty unconscious desires, from eventually making a satisfying love relationship owing to castration fear, however cleverly rationalized. Such extreme cases would be termed, of course, neurotic; but the neurotic differs only in degree, not in kind, from the normal. The normal woman, it is held, resolves this deprivation complex with tolerable success by her compensating specifically feminine functions such as child-bearing, home-making and the like; she thus becomes man's equal, and is vindicated. In man the complex is commonly resolved, it is said, by the achievement of that creative work which is the distinctive male contribution.

Barbara Low then proceeds to apply these " facts " (as she calls them) to " the coeducational ideal, which posits the same capacities in both sexes, calling for an identical training, a pursuit of the same activities mental and physical, and a common goal

for intellectual, sexual and emotional development." This being her notion of " the coeducational ideal," she has little difficulty in showing that such parallelism and competition with the male makes the girl's castration complex still more difficult to resolve, since the ideals set before her tend to deflect her from the achievements which her instinctive impulses demand, and make desirable in their stead the man's achievements, thus reinforcing the unconscious sense of inferiority and loss. In such a " coeducational ideal " the boy, stripped of the opportunity for his distinctive creative act—in the sublimated form of work or sport or whatever it may be—and finding himself compelled to share his male activities with the girl, even perhaps to see her outshine him in the same sphere, may find his adjustment extraordinarily difficult, or even impossible. But Barbara Low's " coeducational ideal " is the creature of her own brain, and would most certainly be disavowed by any thoughtful coeducational teacher. It is more than a little odd that a practitioner of such eminence in one art should not be better informed about the educational approach of many practitioners of a kindred art. Every phrase in her description is false. Coeducationists do not posit the same, but complementary, capacities in the two sexes; they emphatically do not prescribe identical training (it is almost impossible to believe that anyone who should suppose that they do has ever taken the trouble to walk inside a coeducational school); while the mental activities pursued by the children

are to some extent—though not altogether—the same, the physical activities are certainly not the same; and the goal of intellectual, sexual and emotional development is not " common "—not an androgynous amalgam, but true masculinity for the male and true femininity for the female, which, it may be held, can only be attained by either sex through the companionship and the help of the other.

But the objection to coeducation based upon the existence of a castration complex may be fully met even on grounds of its own choosing. The fact is that girls do accept womanhood and do become happy mothers. If a little girl harbours a resentment at being deprived of an organ which boys possess, equally a little boy may (and occasionally does) feel disappointed that he is incapable of bearing a baby. There is nothing to be done about it; the deprivation of either sex is not a thing that can, or should, be indefinitely concealed from the other; and in any case both boys and girls have enormous and obvious compensatory advantages. There is, as we have seen, a stage in pre-puberty and early adolescence when girls are normally ahead of boys, intellectually and to some extent even physically; and this should go far to cancel out any feelings of inferiority. The argument from the castration complex is, if it has any validity at all, directed not so much against coeducation as against bi-sexual human nature, against life itself. Coeducation would appear, in point of fact, to do far more than segregation

to resolve the complex; for it provides opportunities for comparison, and brings to light the compensatory advantages of either sex, instead of intensifying the girl's sense of loss, and the boy's sense of frustration, by withholding knowledge of the other. The right technique for the complex is surely to liquidate it by conscious acceptance and examination. It is simply not true to say that coeducation offers no opportunity for the practice of aggressiveness in the male and the mother instinct in the female, if these are among the most important compensations; exactly the reverse is true—there are more opportunities for boys and girls to play their distinctive sexual role, since they are placed in balanced, not lop-sided, psychological surroundings. What coeducation does not do is to encourage the excessive development of sexual differences; but then some of us do not particularly want a world where woman is occupied exclusively in gestation and man in the destruction of his fellow creatures. If girls and boys at coeducational schools are riddled with the castration complex, the only possible reply of those who work at such schools is that they seem to keep very well on it.

There is another psychological criticism, on the specifically sexual side, which deserves to be considered. This concerns the claim made by some coeducationists that the sexual element is noticeably absent in their schools, and is replaced by what is known, not very pleasantly, as " frank camaraderie." Barbara Low declares that such a state of affairs can

rarely be true; and that if it could become true, it would result in a very disadvantageous situation for both male and female. The sexual impulse, as she rightly points out, can be diverted, suppressed or sublimated, but never extinguished; so that if the apparent relationship between the pupils shows absence of sexual feeling, one is forced to conclude that one of the processes mentioned has taken place. If it is diversion, then nothing radical has been effected by coeducation; true sublimation is hardly possible at this stage, since it could only occur through a transference from the sexual to the non-sexual of so wholesale a nature that it must involve a high degree of repression, so that the sublimated residue is merely disguised as indifference, neutrality or "safe" comradeship. So the argument runs. The answer is: what channels does this school of psychology expect any school to provide for sexual energy, since it objects to the use of all those known to its science? Coeducation cannot claim to have successfully solved a problem which may, after all, admit of no solution—the problem of the time-lag between physical capacity for sexual relationships and psychological readiness for them; but at least it may claim to have found better channels for the adolescent sexual impulse than the time-dishonoured ones employed by segregated education—suppression and perversion. To a certain unavoidable extent there is suppression, even in coeducation; but over the greater part of the sexual field there is, in a properly conducted school, sublimation of the most

satisfying possible nature, since sex is not departmentalized, but forms a ground-bass to the children's whole lives. (The proviso "properly conducted" is necessary, for of course it is possible to run coeducation on sheer suppression; and a bad coeducational school may well be worse than a good segregated one.) The sexual atmosphere of a coeducational school is always an object of suspicion to those who, through fear or jealousy, or one reason or another, disapprove of the system. To a certain extent, criticism of the "frank camaraderie" attitude is justified: when adults emphasize the "silliness" of boy and girl friendships (which are often the most sensible things occurring at the school), they are usually emphasizing only their own fears of sex. There is a class of teachers who have substituted the word "foolish" for the word "wicked," and think that they have thus achieved emancipation from prejudice; but it is not quite as simple as that. Where the critics go astray is in supposing that life at a coeducational school is all sex; here again, one can only suggest that they pay a visit to a few such schools, and see for themselves. If coeducation does result in a certain amount of sex stimulation—which nobody would deny—it is probably no greater than at segregated schools; and it is incomparably healthier. This whole matter will be more fully dealt with, with the care it deserves, in a later chapter of this book.

A third point in the psycho-analytical criticism is based on the existence of a homosexual stage of

adolescence. At such a stage, Barbara Low declares, coeducation is doing violence to the child's instinctive impulses: either the opposite sex is ignored, although nominally coeducation is carried out, or else the child is dominated by the ideal of authority and appears to accept the situation, while underneath it may be strongly antagonistic. But this whole assumption of an inevitable homosexual phase is more than questionable. Most girls and boys certainly do, as every teacher knows, pass through a period when their emotional inclinations are entirely towards members of their own sex. This ganging of boys and clustering of girls has been plausibly explained as a reaction to a dim premonition of mutual attraction between the sexes, involving emotional responses and responsibilities for which the child feels that it is not ready; hence a temporary withdrawal from the opposite sex, and a mutual strengthening of defence by alliance. Deep-seated emotional homosexual attachments, on the other hand, are the product entirely of the segregated boarding school, which is shouldering a tremendous psychological responsibility in the dangers of homo-sexual fixation to which it deliberately subjects its pupils. If the homosexual phase is as significant as psycho-analysis would have us believe, as a necessary prelude to psycho-sexual maturity, coeducation is rendering an important service by providing the surroundings in which it may be most happily lived through, with the least possible sense of frustration in its closing stages.

We have finished our survey—necessarily superficial and incomplete—of the differences, physical, intellectual and psychological, between the two sexes. Can we be said to have come any nearer answering Plato's question ? We have certainly not determined what are the radical and essential characters of women and men uninfluenced by external modifying conditions; that is a quite impossible task. But we may claim to have met all the arguments brought forward to show that boy and girl nature is so different that common upbringing is unwise, or even impossible; and to have shown good reason why common upbringing may, on the contrary, help each sex better to realise its own true nature. All our investigations—and this would still be true if we were to dig a hundred times as deep as we have done—cannot tell us what women and men ought to be, or what they might be, but only what they actually are in the existing conditions of civilization. There is reason to think that their natures are, under varying conditions, capable of indefinite modification.

Two things that have clearly emerged are the greater variability of the male and the greater precocity of the female; and both are of capital importance for education. But it is quite unwarrantable to assume, as for instance Herbert Spencer did, that the general organic approximation of woman to the child type shows her to be " undeveloped man." That the adult male diverges to a greater extent from the infantile than the adult female is on the whole

certainly true, not only of human life but of animal life generally. But Havelock Ellis (from whom much of our argument is drawn) points out that among the anthropoids the infant ape is very much nearer to man than the adult ape, which means that the infant ape is higher in the line of evolution than the adult, and that the female ape, by approximating to the infant type, is somewhat higher than the male. It would thus be just as reasonable to speak of man as undeveloped woman. The closing couplet of Goethe's *Faust* is not only good poetry but sound biology. The interplay of the sexes appears to function in perfect co-ordination. The special liability of women to be affected by minor vital oscillations is balanced by a special resistance to more serious oscillations; and their affectability is compensated by their disvulnerability. While the greater variability of men produces the most brilliant human phenomena, it also produces the most harmful deviations from the norm of the species. The sexual balance is found to be adjusted in the most delicate equipoise; the whole essence of the two sexes is that they should exist and grow in constant juxtaposition; can we be sure that we are acting wisely in artificially separating them during the years of growth ?

CHAPTER V

HISTORICAL SURVEY OF COEDUCATION

HISTORICALLY speaking, segregated education may be held to be an accident: most schools were founded at a time when education was thought unnecessary or even improper for girls. Education was invented by man for man, and is still thought of by many people as a male prerogative; we are only gradually learning that both men and women are first of all human beings. Had the growth of the school occurred at any other time during the development of the race, it is difficult to suppose that segregation would have been the norm; as it is, the custom of bringing up girls and boys separately may be regarded as a medieval innovation—before that time the true place of education was the home, and Nature's methods have been coeducational from a very early date. Thus coeducation is, in one sense, the most ancient as it is the most modern of all the forms of upbringing. But it must be admitted that in the history of education in the narrow sense—in the history of schools—coeducation is only sporadic; all that this survey can hope to do is to lift the curtain here and there, to find evidences of it in different states of European society—for it

would be unprofitable for our purpose to venture far outside it.

In the early history of our civilization man's constant struggle with Nature gave physical force a prominence quite out of proportion to its real value in the scale of human worth. The differences between the educational requirements of men and women were so great as to make coeducation an impossibility. There is, as we should expect, throughout history a close correlation between the degree of coeducation and the development in humaneness of the current view of women; where woman has been respected, on the whole education has been shared between the sexes, and where—as in some modern totalitarian States—she is essentially despised or relegated to the position of a breeding animal, coeducation is found to languish. In ancient China the girl appears to have received only household training, and was permitted no familiarity with the language and sacred literature which formed the basis of a boy's education. In ancient India woman was the child-bearer only. In ancient Egypt a girl could be taught to read and write, but little else. Among the Hebrews we find the natural corollary of their view of woman, which was a high one then as it is today. The home was the Hebrew school, and family life the teacher of morals. Higher education was concerned chiefly with advanced study of the law, and girls had therefore no part in it; but all real primary education they shared with the boys. It is worthy of note that, in later times at

least, no unmarried men or women were allowed to undertake the duties of teachers.[1] That much attention was paid to the private instruction of girls is clear from the Talmudic writings; the Rabbis did not recommend advanced education in Hebrew for them, but they did give them sound training in domestic science, religion and foreign languages, especially Greek.

In the classical age of Greece there is suddenly an abundance of evidence concerning educational method.[2] At Sparta the young boy, up till the age of seven, was normally taken to his father's club to feed, while the girl had meals at home with her mother—for women had no syssitia of their own. After seven the boy was attached to a kind of public school house system, being under the control of a paedonomus and attended by the ominous-sounding mastigophoroi. Indeed, the Spartan schools, with their prefect system (the bouagoi appear to have been a kind of "blood"), fagging and corporal punishment, remind one irresistibly of the schools which still exist as a vestigial organ of our own educational scheme. Spartan boys were practically never left to their own devices, and punishments were very severe; and "perhaps," to quote one who was an enthusiastic supporter of the English public school,[3] "that is the secret of the moral failure of nearly

[1] B. Spiers: *The School System of the Talmud* (Elliott Stock), 1898.
[2] See especially Xenophon: *Constitution of Sparta*, ii, 2; Plutarch: *Lycurgus*, 16.
[3] Kenneth J. Freeman: *Schools of Hellas*, 600-300 *B.C.* (Macmillan), 1907.

every Spartan who was given a position of authority outside Lacedaemon; for responsibility requires practice." (The position of women in Sparta was notably higher than in many contemporary communities, and girls shared in the physical training at the gymnasia[1]—wrestling, running and swimming —and in musical exercises.) They joined the boys in festival processions, and in general were able to mix very freely with them socially until marriage, after which a greater degree of separation was customary. (At Athens the girls received no regular education beyond a little domestic science—making men's and women's clothes, pastry and bread. Marriages were arranged over their heads, and wives mostly led secluded domestic lives.) In the often-quoted words which Thucydides puts into the mouth of Pericles in the Funeral Speech, the ideal of womanhood was "not to be spoken of either for praise or blame among men."[2] They were, moreover, wholly excluded from athletic exercise. In Argos we learn of foot races for girls, and in Chios of their wrestling in the gymnasia, but these regulations appear to be exceptional; in the Dorian States other than Sparta, feminine athletics were given little encouragement. (In Persia there were, according to Xenophon,[3] only boys' schools, but he himself appears to have approved of the Spartan system; and it seems quite possible that there was some degree of coeducation at the Persian court.[4])

[1] Xenophon: *op. cit.*, i, 4.
[2] Thucydides: *History*, II, 45.
[3] *Education of Cyrus*.
[4] Xenophon: *Anabasis*, i.

Plato, as has already been mentioned, was a convinced believer in the equality of the sexes, and in the *Republic*[1] he lays down that there shall be the same education for women as for men, in association. He is well aware that the idea is ridiculous "according to present notions," and ruefully admits that in the gymnasia the female sex will "certainly not be a vision of beauty." He concedes that they may be physically weaker, but he can find no reason for supposing that they are not essentially of similar nature to man, and he makes the point (which modern experience has tended to confirm) that they are equally capable of government. There is some validity in Rousseau's criticism of Plato's treatment of education in the *Republic*, that "having got rid of the family, there is no place for women in his system of government, so he is forced to turn them into men." Plato's notion of a woman is a shade too like Mary Wollstonecraft. There is a much more detailed and mature discussion of education in the *Laws*; the *Republic* represents Plato's views at forty, but the *Laws* shows the influence of another thirty years of experience and thought on the question. Here education is universal and compulsory for all citizens of both sexes. He will still have the girls trained in a manner similar to the boys, making no reservation even in the matter of horsemanship or physical training.[2] But he envisages some degree of segregation after childhood: "boys and girls shall play together up to the age of six, but after that they

[1] Book V.

[2] *Laws*, VII, 804.

shall learn different things—though girls may, if they please, share in the boys' instruction." He approves of boys being taught by women as well as by men, and puts women in charge of their games and meals.[1] He holds strong views on the subject of different music for the two sexes, and on the wisdom of training children to be ambidextrous and ambicrural. He discusses adolescent love affairs very fully and sensibly.[2] (Plato's own practice as a teacher was coeducational, and women were admitted to the inner circle of his Academy,) the first university, on equal terms with men. The fact that there were secondary schools for girls as well as boys in the Macedonian age is probably due to the influence wielded by members of the Academy as educational authorities.

(In early republican Rome) the important social unit was the family, and schools—if indeed there were any before the contact with Hellenism—were only regarded as supplementary to home training. This was probably given mostly by the mother, who wielded very considerable moral influence, to boys and girls together. (There appear to have been no public schools; the evidence for them in Dionysius is doubtful, and though a passage in Livy[3] suggests the existence of coeducational schools in the middle of the fifth century B.C., it is too vague to build on. In the last two centuries B.C., Hellenic influence began to make itself felt in Roman education;)

[1] *Laws*, VII, 794-5.
[2] *ibid.* 835 ff.
[3] *History*, III, 44.

schools of the Greek type became widely established, and lasted until the beginnings of imperial decay in the second century A.D. But old-fashioned families continued to feel that such secondary schools provided only intellectual training, and preferred to give their children moral training at home, with perhaps a Greek tutor; on the whole it was the children of poorer families that went to school. It is curiously difficult to determine whether girls went to the same schools as boys;[1] there is casual reference in Horace to the female pupils of an eminent musician, and a passage in Suetonius that seems to suggest coeducation, but the evidence is unconvincing. It does seem certain that girls had the same kind of instruction as boys, even if it was not shared with them. Some epigrams of Martial suggest that coeducation prevailed in primary schools at Rome;[2] and a tombstone at Capua, depicting a schoolmaster with a boy on one side and a girl on the other, bears out the suggestion; but the latter is in any case no evidence for the practice of the capital—very probably coeducation was common in country places, though not in Rome itself. Tacitus sighs for the old-fashioned education of the home, and laments[3] the delegation of the father's responsibility to the schoolmaster. Much later, in the tenth century, Quintilian[4] also compares school and home life to

[1] See A. S. Wilkins: *Roman Education* (Cambridge), 1905, for the evidence.

[2] cf. *Ep.*, VIII, 3, 13, and IX, 68.

[3] *Dialogue on Orators*, 28-9, 34-5.

[4] *Institutio Oratoria*.

the advantage of the latter; he does indeed expect both parents of his Orator to be cultured, but that is scarcely evidence of widespread female education in his time. Our general conclusion must be that the prevailing instinct of ancient Rome was against the common upbringing of girls and boys. One lonely witness to coeducation has been omitted in this rapid sketch of Roman practice—the gentle Caius Musonius Rufus, a Stoic of the degenerate period of Nero's reign, in the latter half of the first century A.D.; in a series of essays written in Greek on morals and education[1] Musonius pleads, with no great eloquence but considerable sincerity, for coeducation on the grounds of sheer fairness to girls.

(The effect of Christianity upon education was profound, but slow in operation. Christianity laid the foundations, in the pagan world, of a better view of women,) which bore within itself the germs of coeducation—the belief that every human soul was of equal value in the sight of God could, in the end, have no other conclusion. In the early part of the third century A.D. Christian schools for the instruction of converts began to be founded: these catechetical

Bishop's house,
was that of the
them, to train
vere, of course,
created a high
ertheless, great

nd *Whether daughters*

should be taught on a par with sons.

ERRATUM

Page 68. For "Much later, in the tenth century," read "In the same century".

the advantage of the latter; he does indeed expect both parents of his Orator to be cultured, but that is scarcely evidence of widespread female education in his time. Our general conclusion must be that the prevailing instinct of ancient Rome was against the common upbringing of girls and boys. One lonely witness to coeducation has been omitted in this rapid sketch of Roman practice—the gentle Caius Musonius Rufus, a Stoic of the degenerate period of Nero's reign, in the latter half of the first century A.D.; in a series of essays written in Greek on morals and education[1] Musonius pleads, with no great eloquence but considerable sincerity, for coeducation on the grounds of sheer fairness to girls.

(The effect of Christianity upon education was profound, but slow in operation. Christianity laid the foundations, in the pagan world, of a better view of women,) which bore within itself the germs of coeducation—the belief that every human soul was of equal value in the sight of God could, in the end, have no other conclusion. In the early part of the third century A.D. Christian schools for the instruction of converts began to be founded; these catechetical schools were often established in the Bishop's house, and it was their principal object, as it was that of the monastic schools later modelled on them, to train young men for the Church. They were, of course, segregational; the religion which created a high ideal of womanhood attached, nevertheless, great

[1] Especially *That women too should philosophize*, and *Whether daughters should be taught on a par with sons*.

value to celibacy among men; and the emphasis on the sinfulness of human reproduction seemed to cast a slur of inferiority upon the sex that was more intimately concerned with it. With the collapse of the Empire this chapter of European education closes; the tradition of the Roman schools was overthrown by the Frankish invasion and the rise of the monastic schools of Cassian, whose *Institutiones* (in the early fifth century A.D.) were accepted as the rule for the monastic life of Gaul. The distrust of pagan learning which was to last for centuries now set in; and the old municipal schools of Italy underwent a process of slow decay. Only a few of the strictly monastic schools survived the break-up of the old Empire.

In the Eastern Church, whose priests have for a long time not taken kindly to celibacy, there is some evidence that girls, as well as boys, attended monastic schools up till the age of sixteen or seventeen. Many of these schools were partly secular in purpose, although no one could open a school without a licence from the scholasticus of the Bishop's school; the sons and daughters of the nobility began to attend them, to receive the same education as those preparing for the priesthood, and this coeducational tradition of the Eastern "monastic" educational system appears to have lasted for some centuries. In the West, ecclesiastical domination became the central feature of education. An interesting coeducational landmark is Charlemagne's pioneer court school at Aachen at the end of the eighth century; Alcuin of York was appointed tutor here

in A.D. 782, and taught the young princes and their sisters, as well as adult men and women, together. A century later Alfred the Great had a similar mixed school established at his court. In general, learning and education were the sole charge of the religious orders; and university administration and government were everywhere conducted by clerical persons. The ability even to read was evidence that a man was either a priest or at least in one of the minor orders which placed him under clerical authority. If a criminal on trial for life showed an ability to read simple Latin, the Bishop's officer might snatch him off as a " cleric " to the Church court, where he was in no further danger of death or mutilation. Since religious persons were the sole teachers, and religious persons were celibates, schools were naturally for one sex only.

In the age of chivalry the feudal castles became schools of chivalry for both boys and girls; every feudal lord had his court, to which he drew the sons and daughters of the poor gentry of his domain, and his castle was frequented by the children of men of equal rank with himself. Up till the age of seven the boy was kept under women's care at home, where he was taught Christian doctrine and the rules of courtesy, and he was then sent to the castle of some neighbouring baron, with other boys and girls. At fourteen began his more manly education as a squire, and in the mixture of knightly tradition and religious and intellectual culture may be found the germ of the later English grammar school. As for the girls, they

entertained the knights who visited the castle, and dressed their wounds after combat. It seems as if girls and boys were thus brought up together throughout adolescence.

A coeducational landmark in Europe in the fifteenth century was the famous court school of Vittorino da Feltre at Mantua. This coeducational boarding school, founded in 1423, was characterized by some measure of self-government among the children, and became the model for similar court schools, combining home life with a scholastic curriculum, which were later established by several other great Renaissance houses.

The Reformation began a profound change in English education, but the religious tradition continued uninterrupted; the king who abolished the Monastery became the pious founder of the School; from the old monastic school the English grammar school was born, and with part of the monastic revenues it was endowed. Still no girls were admitted; indeed, the Harrow Rules of 1590 expressly stated that " no girls shall be received to be taught in the School," lest the absence of any direct prohibition might leave a loophole for their introduction. But there was gradually growing up a demand for female education; in 1554 Thomas Becon, a clergyman who had fled abroad because of his Protestantism in Mary's reign, returned to plead eloquently for the establishment of girls' schools. To Bunbury Grammar School, founded in 1594, girls were admitted by statute, but their number was

limited, and none were to remain " above the age of nine, nor longer than they may learn to read English." [1] The usual age of entrance at this time was seven years. The dissolution of the nunneries had deprived women of their only means of organized education. Still, Protestantism was in the end to prove a good champion of girls' schools, as of coeducation: Luther, who has been called the " father of modern coeducation," wanted girls and boys to be educated for citizenship together, and his influence may be traced in the primary mixed schools of Germany, Scotland and New England.

In Elizabethan times there is some evidence of the superior education of women; Lady Jane Grey was not the only bluestocking to profit by home tuition, and the distinguished educationist Richard Mulcaster, master of Edmund Spenser, when he " admits young maidens to learn," says that " the custom of my country . . . hath made the maiden's train her own approved travail."

In the seventeenth century, education at boys' schools seems to have been haphazard and brutal, while girls were usually given no instruction at all. It may be possible to relate the degradation of society during the Restoration period, and the contempt for woman so often shown in contemporary literature, with the strict segregation of boys and girls during their upbringing. In America, on the other hand, from the earliest days of New England the district schools in small towns were open to both sexes alike,

[1] Foster Watson: *The Old Grammar Schools* (Cambridge), 1916.

though probably the girls never got much beyond reading and writing. It was here, anyhow, that the foundations of modern coeducation were laid. In 1678 provision was made in Connecticut for the common education of the sexes, and Massachusetts followed in 1680. In all the Eastern States, with their strong Puritan tradition, coeducation soon became firmly rooted; and gradually—chiefly from reasons of economy and convenience—it spread. In the West it was less a matter of religious than of democratic principle.

In the eighteenth century some famous bluestockings—Mrs. Thrale, Fanny Burney and Hannah More among others—make their appearance; and during this period numerous boarding schools for young ladies were founded. Across the channel Fénelon's "point des garçons avec les filles!" [1] was still the rule, but in England the Quaker view of women was beginning to make itself felt. Ackworth School was established in 1779 by the London Yearly Meeting, for the education of girls and boys—in separate schools, certainly. Sidcot School was founded in 1808 by the Associated Quarterly Meetings in the West of England; here boys and girls were sometimes taught together, and in the course of time the school gradually approached coeducation. It is sometimes supposed that the Friends were great coeducational pioneers; this is not so—girls' education, along the same lines as boys', was their special concern, and it was only accidentally that their

[1] In his *L'éducation des filles*.

"dual" schools sometimes approximated to mixed schools. Boys' education appears to have been at a low ebb during this period, if Cowper is a trustworthy guide; his *Tirocinium* (1785) is extraordinarily modern in tone as an account of the "public schools that public folly needs"—his criticism of their immorality, bullying, competitive spirit, narrow curriculum and lack of home refinements is not altogether inapplicable to our own day. The year 1792 saw the publication of Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, in which the case for coeducational day schools was boldly stated. Her arguments have an old-fashioned ring about them now: she wanted to abolish, rather than to harmonize, sex differences, and tried to establish the equality of women and men by proving that they were the same. But in spite of this, her twelfth chapter contains some good and sensible things, which later moved Mr. Gladstone to pencil in the margin of his copy of the *Vindication*: "Tho' I know not what to say of the scheme of educating boys and girls together, yet on the whole I think this is the [best] chapter in the book, and many hints in it worth consideration." Abroad, Pestalozzi was experimenting with a series of unconventional schools, believing that educational institutions should be modelled on the analogy of the home and family. At Stanz (1798-9) he had girls and boys between the ages of five and fifteen educated in one house, and Burghof (1799-1804) was to some extent coeducational, though his final school at Yverdun (1804-25)

contained two separate buildings for the two sexes, who, however, enjoyed social intercourse and interchanged their teachers. (This idea was later adopted by Comte, who advocated[1] the instruction of pupils of both sexes, successively, by the same teacher.)

[1] In his *Système de Politique Positive*, iv, 266.

CHAPTER VI

NINETEENTH-CENTURY CHANGES IN EDUCATION

THE rise of coeducation in England at the end of the nineteenth century can be properly understood only in relation to two other movements, the changing spirit in boys' schools and the movement for women's education. At the turn of the century the public school was a grim kind of place, cultivating at best a few savage virtues. If life in it was not always Shelley's "world of woes, the harsh and grating strife of tyrants and of foes," Leigh Hunt's cheerless account of his school days, Lord John Russell's horror of school, and Lord Shaftesbury's early educational experiences are not the only evidence that the system was in a far from healthy condition. There were only seven public schools proper, and these stood low in popular esteem—the food was bad, the discipline bad, and the standard of learning low. There were only two universities; Nonconformists were not permitted to graduate at Cambridge, and were excluded altogether from Oxford. Here too the state of scholarship was poor. In the nation at large there were some seven hundred well-established secondary schools, and several thousand private schools, mostly bad ones. It was not until 1833 that

Parliament made the first grant in aid of elementary education. In 1828, when transit had suddenly been made much easier by the advent of railways, and there was a considerable increase of wealth among the comfortably-off classes, Thomas Arnold accepted the headmastership of Rugby. The next thirty years were to see the foundation of numerous public schools looking to his work at Rugby for their inspiration.

The central features of the public school system—the prefect system, the organized games, the strong sense of tradition, and all the rest—are not so old English as some of its supporters would like to believe. There were for instance no organized games at Rugby before Arnold's time, and "the only former playground of the well-flogged boys was the churchyard." Arnold instituted games as one of the pillars of his Christian education, and established government by the Sixth Form. Contrary to the general notion, he seems never to have believed very profoundly in the system with which his name is so permanently linked; his letters written from Rugby are many of them extremely gloomy and sceptical. "Christian boys I can scarcely hope to make . . ." he says; "I suspect that a low standard of morals in many respects must be tolerated amongst them." [1] And again: "Another system may be better in itself, but I am placed in this system, and am bound to try what I can make of it." To a friend he writes

[1] These and the succeeding quotations are all from Dean Stanley's *Life of Arnold* (Ward Lock & Co.), 1844.

that the very sight of a knot of vicious or careless boys gathered together round the school-house fire " makes me think that I see the Devil in the midst of them." (In how many schools is Arnold's shade still stalking today!) He could hardly trust his school to educate his own boys: " The difficulties of education stare me in the face, whenever I look at my own boys. I think by and by that I shall put them into the school here, but I shall do it with trembling." He had on the whole a very low opinion of boy nature, and little faith in the power of education to amend character; it was his considered policy to capitulate to educational difficulties—" Till a man learn that the first, second, and third duty of a schoolmaster is to get rid of unpromising subjects, a great public school will never be what it might be, and what it ought to be "—and he used ruthlessly to remove his failures.

Thring of Uppingham had exactly opposite views on the importance of believing in difficult boy material. Arnold ought never to have been a schoolmaster, but Thring possessed the first requisite of a good teacher, a reverence for personality. In a strange half-mystical way too, Thring was groping towards coeducation; he worked hard for women's rights, felt keenly the deficiencies of public schools as monastic establishments, and believed in the necessity of linking up school life with normal home life. But he never actually advocated the common upbringing of the sexes. The spirit of Thring, as well as that of Arnold, is abroad in the public schools today, and

their essentially different methods have been struggling for mastery throughout the years since they died; which influence generally comes uppermost, is not a subject that can profitably be discussed here.

Outside the public schools, meanwhile, interest in education was fermenting; Jeremy Bentham and Robert Owen were demanding good popular democratic education in their several spheres, and the religious denominations were busy founding schools. Nearly a million children were getting a smattering of instruction in the National Schools. The Royal Commission, which sat from 1858-61, reported the existence of 573,000 children in private schools, 671,000 in denominational and factory schools—neither of which type had any grant—and 917,000 in schools, mostly denominational, in receipt of some financial grant. (It also found that the curriculum of the public schools had remained unaltered since the Renaissance.) The Education Act of 1870 sought to fill in the gaps of this system, and to provide a little more equality of opportunity; as a result, local board schools were set up. The "higher grade" elementary school began in 1894, with the object of continuing with a degree of secondary education. But it was not until 1900 that it was finally decided to abolish elementary school fees; there were at the time 3,351 separate and independent authorities for elementary education, which were reduced by the Education Act of 1902 to 328. Thus local control of education in this country was

ratified, and the gradual rise of secondary education made possible. The public school system, with its appendage, the boys' preparatory school system, was left practically untouched; and preparatory schools are still—by reason of their dependence on the public schools and their subjection to the requirements of the Common Entrance examination—the unfortunate sufferers from an abuse which was abolished from the elementary schools more than half a century ago: payment by results. This was introduced by the code of 1862, but soon afterwards abandoned.

The aim of girls' education, almost down to the opening of the nineteenth century, differed little from the simple course described by St. Jerome in the fourth century, consisting of religious instruction, reading, writing, grammar and spinning.[1] In the late eighteenth century some French, Italian, music and drawing were occasionally added. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the education of women was in general at a low ebb, being scanty, superficial and incoherent. The modern parent's requirements of a girls' school are vague—necessarily so in a world where social values are shifting as rapidly as at present; but a hundred years ago they were almost brutally definite: the object for which a girl was supposed to be brought up was a "good" marriage. Even as late as 1868, the Schools Enquiry

[1] *Epistles*, 107, 108; quoted in the *Report on Differentiation of the Curricula* (see p. 38 footnote), to which I am indebted for much of the sketch that follows.

Commission, while admitting the "solid attainments" in female education which recent years had brought, regarded them as "actually disadvantageous to marriage." Yet female education during many of those years had been by no means bluestocking in character. Jane Austen's heroines have polite accomplishments, which they practise gracefully and with ease; but they scarcely seem to read intelligently. They are all too conscious of the ulterior aim of such accomplishments as their parents have procured for them. The eighteenth-century tradition by which well-educated fathers sometimes became tutors to their girls—even occasionally handing on to them a smattering of Latin—continued during the early years of the new century; and the whole tradition of home education for daughters lingered, especially among aristocratic families, well into the age of the modern girls' school, even till the closing years of the century. Charlotte Yonge, in her *Womankind*, recommends the possible methods of female education in the following order: teaching by the father at home; teaching by the mother or elder sister; a good governess; and, fourth and least desirable, a good school. The size of the well-to-do Victorian family often, indeed, made home education the most economical plan to follow; this would usually be rounded off by some months at a finishing school at home or abroad. In the girls' schools that did exist, school life must often have been a depressing business. Physical exercise was considered almost indecent for young females;

there was widespread ignorance, or hushing up, of the most elementary points of hygiene—it appears to have been, for instance, no uncommon thing for girls to faint in class, on account of tight stays—and the dormitory conditions were occasionally frightful.[1] But the practice of sending girls to boarding schools increased steadily, with the increase of travelling facilities on the railways. Often the staff of such schools was drawn from the principal's own family circle: the example of the Brontë sisters is a well-known one; Hannah More had done the same thing with her sisters, and the Miss Lawrences of Roedean kept the tradition alive in the last decade of the century.

The movement for better girls' education may fairly be dated from 1843, the year of the founding of the Governesses' Benevolent Institution. In 1846 their Secretary began to form a registry of women teachers, out of which arose a system of examinations and diplomas of proficiency for teachers. Anything approaching proficiency was quickly found to be so rare that classes were started to instruct the governesses, and professors from King's College, London, used to come without fee on certain evenings in the week. By 1848 the new institution began to become popular, and in 1852 Queen's College in Harley Street took on its formal, independent existence. (It was not the first college to admit women: they had

[1] I am much indebted to the account of the development of girls' education during the century, with entertaining literary illustrations, given in Alicia Percival: *The English Miss, Today and Yesterday* (Harrap), 1939.

been allowed to go to King's and University Colleges since 1828, and the academic standard there was certainly higher. But that was partly the trouble—the standard was too high; besides, University College was undenominational, and therefore hardly respectable; and it was unladylike to share a lecture room with men.) Queen's College had a twofold purpose: the training of women teachers, with the granting of certificates of proficiency at the end of their course; and the provision of secondary education for girls. The academic standard at Queen's amounted, really, to little more than that; and the general level of girls' schools was so low that it later became necessary to establish special secondary schools to prepare pupils for entrance to the College. Six months after the foundation of Queen's, came Bedford College, managed by a mixed board—a bold innovation. Queen's was entirely man-controlled from the start; among its most enthusiastic supporters were the Christian Socialists, F. D. Maurice (the first Principal) and Charles Kingsley, and its teachers included Sterndale Bennett, Stopford Brooke and Dean Stanley. All lectures were, of course, attended by devoted and unpaid chaperones. The Mechanics Institute, now Birkbeck College, was thrown open to women during the 'fifties.

That decade also saw the foundation of two girls' schools which were long to serve as models for secondary day and boarding schools; for among the early students at Queen's were those distinguished

Dioscuri of female education, Dorothea Beale and Frances Buss. The North London Collegiate School was started in 1850 as a private school by Miss Buss, to be reorganized as a public school under a trust in 1870; and in 1858 Miss Beale, then assistant mistress at the School for Clergymen's Daughters, was appointed to reorganize the Ladies' College at Cheltenham, established five years previously. She had been a lady tutor in mathematics at Queen's College, but had resigned on a point of principle in 1856; she held, very firmly, that girls could be thoroughly educated only by women. At the Clergy Daughters' School (which was the school described at an earlier stage by Charlotte Brontë in *Jane Eyre*) she had been greatly depressed by the working conditions—she herself was expected to teach nine different subjects during the week. At Cheltenham she threw herself into a whirl of organizing activity, even giving up her weekly holiday to chaperoning classes taken by the visiting masters. Miss Buss, meanwhile, was governing the North London Collegiate with a mixture of devotion and horse sense; early on, T. H. Green had made helpful suggestions, and James Bryce was sympathetic. The year 1873 saw the foundation of the Girls' Public Day School Company, whereby out of old endowments new girls' schools were formed or revived, with the North London as their model. At Miss Buss's school there was less social snobbery than at Cheltenham, and a greater degree of religious toleration. The movement for women's higher education, whose

early apostle J. S. Mill had been, was quickly gathering momentum, and made many converts; its demands at first were very modest—better opportunities for girls in their own schools, and the bare right of admission to the universities. Some prominent writers of the time were sympathetic: Ruskin in his *Sesame and Lilies* may be regarded as a pioneer of women's education, though his outlook was gravely limited; and Tennyson's *Princess*—written, it should be remembered, twenty years before the existence of Girton, and two years before the "first college for women"—painted a roseate picture of the new academy that was to be.

The personal feelings of the Misses Beale and Buss had a great deal to do with the development of the curriculum of girls' schools; and it was perhaps unfortunate that emancipation of women tended at first to approximate closely to imitation of men. It was much too readily assumed by the pioneers of women's education that what boys did must be right. Woman, struggling to become free, has since learned that not all man's activities are equally worthy of admiration; but not all the fighters, or the supporters, of female emancipation have discriminated among these with equal wisdom. Some men, observing that the attainment of true womanhood sometimes appears to involve little else but the wearing of trousers and the inhaling of smoke into the lungs (hardly two of man's highest achievements) may at times have been tempted to wonder what all the pother was about. Others will reflect that the

existence of a *Schattenseite* does not invalidate the achievement of an act of social justice. In any case, the characters of two women effectively dominated, for good or ill, the course of girls' education over a period of many years; even the traditional Saturday whole holiday at girls' high schools derives from Miss Buss's wish that her pupils should have time to go marketing with their mothers on that day. The games tradition was added later; the early schools were far from obscurantist in physical matters, and Miss Buss had hygiene taught; but the chief pioneer of the playing fields was Miss Lawrence of Roedean. Games were hit upon chiefly as something suitable to occupy the girls' minds; for after all, as Miss Blanche Clough (niece of the first head of Newnham) said, "one has to take probabilities into account, and consider what would be likely to be in the heads that games fill . . . Games do, I believe, drive out much silliness; they occupy the vacant space, and they also produce an antiseptic atmosphere."

But the face of girls' education was not transformed in the space of a few years. The Schools Enquiry Commission of 1868 found a deplorable state of affairs in most of the existing girls' schools: "want of thoroughness and foundation; want of system; slovenliness and showy superficiality; inattention to rudiments; undue time given to accomplishments, and these not taught intelligently or in any systematic manner; want of organization"—these are only some of the counts in its indictment. It was small comfort to be told that "it is needless to observe that

the same complaints apply to a great extent to boys' education." This Commission was bold enough to take cognizance of the existence of coeducation in the United States, and to realize that five-sixths of the citizens of that country were brought up in each other's company without, apparently, being any the worse for it. One result of the Commission's criticisms was the Endowed Schools' Act of 1869, which enabled the foundation of girls' schools out of the surplus funds of boys' schools. (By 1895 thirty-six such schools had been endowed, and by 1900 there were eighty. The State did little to help, until the Act of 1902 permitted local education authorities to do something for girls' education. The number of girls' schools in the Board of Education's list in that year was ninety-nine, and by 1925 it had risen to 403.)

The struggle for university education was being waged at the same time. In 1863 a small committee of ladies interested in education, with Emily Davies as secretary, had secured the concession that girls should be allowed unofficially to take the papers of the Cambridge Local examination. Pupils were hurriedly prepared, and several girls did well; we learn with interest that the standard of arithmetic was low, and that in Scripture they "answered, quite well, not the question set but some other question." In 1865 the practice was given an official trial for three years, and in 1868 it was accepted permanently. In the next year Emily Davies founded at Hitchin her Women's College, to

which visiting tutors came out twice a week by train from Cambridge. The experiment attracted considerable interest, and Ruskin, Gladstone and Turgenev were among the sightseers. After a while the inconvenience of position was found to be too great, and a move was made to the present buildings of Girton College on the outskirts of Cambridge. (Here, too, the women pioneers adopted the sincerest form of flattery of the other sex: they insisted that the Girton curriculum should be exactly the same as the men's.) Other women's university colleges followed: Bedford (London) in 1869, Newnham (Cambridge) in 1871, Somerville and Lady Margaret Hall (both Oxford) in 1879, and Holloway (London) in 1886. Women's final charter of sex equality in London was won in 1878, when they were admitted to full degrees; the Scottish universities followed this lead in 1889, Wales in 1892, and Oxford after the Great War. At Cambridge women enjoyed what were called, a little oddly in the circumstances, "courtesy" degrees. Some of the pioneers lived on to an old age made happy by a knowledge of the success of their efforts; Miss Buss died at sixty-eight, after nearly half a century's work; Miss Beale died, in harness, at seventy-four; and Emily Davies lived till the age of ninety-one.

Another Royal Commission on Secondary Education in 1895 could report, with evident satisfaction, that "school-keeping is less frequently than it used to be the mere resort of ladies possessing no other means of support"; and it found "no change more

beneficial " than the new interest in education. The enthusiasm had been great; the results were not always happy. In the early pioneer days of women's education, spontaneity and vigour sprang from a constant struggle with difficulties; and many critics of girls' public school education have since felt that they were in grave danger of becoming, in the words of the Consultative Committee's 1923 report, " excellently organized and conscientiously loyal groups composed of mediocre and uniform units." But still, some very valuable work had been done. Things had moved forward from the time when woman was regarded, in Thackeray's biting phrase, as " made for man's enjoyment, along with all the rest of the minor animals." Women had shown that they could be successful imitators of men, but there was still a further step to be taken: both sexes had still to learn to achieve their full stature, not in exploitation or rivalry of the other, but in co-operation. The way was now open for the development of coeducation.

CHAPTER VII

THE RISE OF COEDUCATION IN ENGLAND

The history of coeducation in England is composed of two quite different strands, which even now are imperfectly intermingled: private educational effort and public educational policy. Mixed State schools have grown up in this country largely through a series of accidents, while the pioneer private coeducational schools have developed out of the passionate faith of their founders.

Many of the latter type of school have been abortive, all have had to exist in the face of considerable opposition, an opposition armed with some of the strongest known weapons—prejudice, apathy and ridicule. As early as the late 'fifties in the last century Mme. Bodichon founded the coeducational Portman Hall School, which, though successful for a while, was discontinued in 1864. In the next year W. A. Case founded a boarding and day school for boys and girls at Hampstead, and in 1869 Miss Lushington started a coeducational boarding school at Kingsley in Hampshire. One of the most interesting pioneer schools was Ladybarn, founded in 1873 by W. H. Herford at Withington on the outskirts of Manchester. He and his wife wanted to put into

practice some of the educational ideas of Pestalozzi and Froebel, which they had seen at work in the de Fellenberg Institute at Hofwyl, Switzerland. After three years they had twenty children, and by the turn of the new century the numbers had risen to over seventy. They were mostly only young children, but the school was interesting as containing some of the germs of the " progressive school," such as a measure of self-government.

In 1893 was founded what was to develop into the first fully coeducational boarding school, educating children up to eighteen—J. H. Badley's Bedales. Badley, who was himself educated at Rugby, had first been inspired by seeing coeducation in practice in Norway, while he was on an undergraduate walking tour in 1887. He opened his school—for the first five years for boys only—in a Sussex country house, with three boys, three masters and three mistresses. In two years the numbers rose to thirty-three, after which they suffered a decline. Lowes Dickinson visited the school and reported helpfully on its academic side. The year 1898 saw the change to coeducation, which had from the first been Badley's intention, by the introduction of six girls; the immediate result was the removal of thirty boys. In 1900 came the move to Hampshire, with sixty-eight boys, seven girls, and a resident staff of nine. The numbers soon increased to ninety boys and thirty girls, and a junior department was opened. In 1902 the school was recognized by the Board of Education; it now began its foreign connections,

and from that time always had a number of its pupils from abroad. It was already becoming something of a place of educational pilgrimage. By 1913 a school parliament was introduced, and Bedales felt its way rather cautiously towards the self-government which is an important feature in all progressive schools. In the early days there were different houses for girls and boys, but from half-past eight in the morning till half-past eight at night the children shared each other's company, classes and meals. Bedales was important because its headmaster was a great educationist, with a philosophy of education and of life behind him. The influence of such writers as Walt Whitman, Edward Carpenter, Carlyle and Meredith may be discerned in the early working out of the school's ideals. (Meredith's *Lord Ormont and his Aminta*, published in 1894, with its sympathetic account of a "new" school, was written in ignorance of Bedales; but he was quick to congratulate Badley on bringing into being the type of school which he himself had prophetically seen.)

In 1895 came Bakewell Grammar School, Derbyshire, a re-endowment by public funds of an older school, under the headmastership of C. J. Mansfield. There were less than twenty boarders at first, but by 1902 the total numbers had risen to 143, more than half of them boys, of all ages up to university entrance. Two other coeducational schools were founded during the old century, both of which still flourish. In 1898 C. E. Rice and his wife, who had

both served under Badley at Bedales in its segregational days, started the Hampstead preparatory day school which was later to become King Alfred. Another germ of the progressive school movement existed here in the absence of any academic marks and prizes. In the same year Cecil Grant, who had first-hand knowledge of the dual school system in the United States, founded Keswick School, whose numbers grew in five years to fifty boys and five girls, all of them boarders. Grant was a clergyman, who believed that the public schools had failed to achieve a high religious standard because of the separation of the sexes. He felt, further, very strongly indeed that their monasticism made those schools a stronghold of immorality. There was much of the new wine at Keswick, but much also of the old and nasty bottles. Punishment was " severe and repeated when necessary "—for boys detention and corporal punishment, for girls detention and temporary suspension from school life. Government inspectors came and duly approved.

A daughter school of Keswick was St. George's, Harpenden, founded in 1906 out of a recognition of the failure of " the shibboleths of the smoking room or the half truths of the boudoir " to establish a right relationship between the sexes. It was described as a coeducational public school supported by private trustees. Almost all the Keswick staff, headed by Grant, and several boarder children moved south in a body to form the new school, though Keswick continued its separate existence. Grant's reverence

for personality stopped well short of recognizing the significance of corporal punishment, which he firmly maintained for the correction of boys, while girls were chastened with "purely verbal persuasion." This principle, he explained, "recommends itself to the instinctive chivalry of the boy." With such quips did he defend this odd retention of barbaric methods in a school that was in many other ways enlightened. He was persuaded that "this salutary method of correction and the respect, if not affection, with which it is regarded by the average public school boy, represent one of the finest traditions of the English public schools." (The "if not" is good.) He reflected sadly that this tradition "unfortunately is, as things are, almost a monopoly of the public schools; the newer type of school, which has come in with public secondary education, does not understand and rarely practises it." He defends the system of separate punishments for boys and girls at St. George's in the following words: "Girls' punishment, which is less severe, considered objectively, is often in reality heavier, owing to the girl's greater sensibility." This, if it is thought out, gives away not only his own particular case, but the whole case for punishment at school. With the same vehemence that he used to support one good old public school tradition, he could deplore another—which, if he had only known, was not unconnected with it—namely, sexual immorality. The experiments at Keswick and St. George's were "directly caused by the hope of finding a remedy for the moral evil in

our schools." "But," he added, "we sincerely trust that in the hour of change all that is good and great in the conduct and tradition of the public schools of England will be scrupulously maintained. We recognize that upon the supporters of coeducation is thrown the onus of proving that the many and great advantages which attach to these splendid foundations need not be sacrificed in a school to which girls are admitted." [1] What he was after, in fact, was Public schools without Pederasty—not a very inspiring battle-cry, one would think. But some really serious flaws in these two pioneer schools leave them still deserving of much respect for the valuable work they did in educating public opinion.

In 1915 Dr. Armstrong Smith became the first principal of the Garden City Theosophical School at Letchworth, whose basic principles were belief in (*a*) reincarnation, (*b*) Karma (the law of cause and effect), (*c*) the unity of life and the consequent brotherhood of man, (*d*) wide religious toleration. The school[2] combined a number of very radical educational features, among them self-government, absence of punishment, absence of homework, vegetarianism, and the abolition of academic competition. After three years of existence it had seventy children, twenty-six of whom were boarders; it lasted in its original form until 1929. All the schools established by the Theosophical Educational

[1] These last seven quotations are all from Grant and Hodgson's *Case for Coeducation*—see bibliography.

[2] Described in Armstrong Smith: *Some Ideals in Coeducation* (Theosophical Publishing House), 1919.

Trust were coeducational. By the end of the Great War there was a considerable number of private coeducational schools in England with a leaving age of eighteen or nineteen, many of them boarding schools. It would be profitless to give the detailed history of each of them; many have done important pioneering work, which the interested reader will find more fully described in a symposium containing contributions by their several headmasters.[1]

From the very start of the movement, certain sections of public opinion showed a lively interest; the great mass of people remained, of course, indifferent. Some favourable comments which the Commissioners of 1895[2] unguardedly let drop, stirred opponents of coeducation into lively protest; the burden of complaint of one of their champions[3] was that the evidence was almost entirely contributed by teachers, while the opinion of parents was not considered. It is hard to see why what the teacher said should not be evidence. But already, by 1897, there was in existence an Association for the Promotion of the Coeducation of Boys and Girls, the wording of whose manifesto[4] would scarcely need altering to be applicable today. Its final point is the admirable one that whatever is wanted in the life of a nation must first be introduced into its schools; and we still want a better understanding between the sexes.

[1] *The Modern Schools' Handbook*: ed. Trevor Blewitt (Gollancz), 1934.
[2] See p. 89, last paragraph.
[3] Mabel Hawtrey: *The Coeducation of the Sexes* (Kegan Paul), 1893.
[4] John Ablett: *Why Boys and Girls should be Coeducated*, 1897.

In 1899 the educationist Ennis Richmond, in general a firm advocate of the public schools and certainly no iconoclast, was beginning to have doubts about the wisdom of segregated boarding schools. "The entire education of the average boy on the subject of women or girls," he wrote, "is wrong from his earliest childhood, and nothing fosters the evil so much as the standard, in this respect, of the public schools." [1] He knew the claim of the supporters of such schools, that the boys there seldom thought of women and girls; that, he replied, was true—they thought so little that they never thought rightly, while they were left to feel wrongly. "A boy is made to lead a life which practically shuts him off from women until he has reached an age when—owing to this great defect in his education—contact with them is dangerous." "No one," he concluded, "can teach boys to respect women but women themselves." But he never apparently considered the possibility of coeducation; the furthest he allowed himself to go was the recommendation that housemasters at boarding schools should marry, that boys should associate with girls on holiday, and that every schoolmaster should have a wife or sister living with him. So difficult was it for an intelligent man, himself brought up inside the public school system, to see the remedy for one of its gravest defects. To the defect itself he was acutely sensitive; he saw that boys at segregated schools were bound to keep

[1] This quotation and the next two are from Ennis Richmond: *Through Boyhood to Manhood* (Longmans, Green), 1899.

their ideas of women in the unhealthiest part of their minds. But he never drew the natural conclusion.

In America the most influential psychologist of his day, Stanley Hall, chief creator of the "genetic" philosophy of education, did draw the natural conclusion, and shuddered at it. His book *Adolescence*[1] is an omnium gatherum of arguments, quotations, rhapsodizings and curious information about the years of human growth, which had a wide influence upon public opinion in his time, and is still in many respects worth reading today. (Some idea of its scope may be gathered from the fact that there are two thousand entries in the name index alone.) Stanley Hall was a firm upholder of the theory of the anabolic nature of woman, and a firm opponent of coeducation, which, he claimed, "violates a custom so universal that it seems to express a fundamental instinct. In all ages of history and in all stages of civilization, from savagery up, in the Orient, in ancient Greece and Rome, and, with few exceptions, in modern Europe, the dawn of puberty is marked by segregation of the sexes, especially for every purpose that can be called educational."[2] Two comments may properly be made on this statement: first, it is simply not true; secondly, this precious care for the "dawn of puberty" takes the form, among the English-speaking well-to-do classes for whom Stanley Hall was writing, of suddenly transferring children

[1] Stanley Hall: *Adolescence*, 2 vols. (Appleton & Co.), 1904.
[2] From his *Address to the American Academy of Medicine*, Boston, 1906.

from one educational milieu to another—the uprooting from their preparatory school coinciding, almost invariably, with the painful onset of adolescence. He has grave doubts about the "nubility of educated women"; he refers to feminine influence upon the male sex as a "subtle eviration." Altogether, what with the denubilization of one sex and the mulierization of the other, coeducation seems a sad business. Yet he was not convinced that the influence of the sexes upon each other was entirely poisonous: in his ideal girls' school there should be "at least one healthful, wise, large-souled, honourable, married and attractive man . . . so poised that impulsive girls can turn their hearts inside out in his presence and perhaps even weep on his shoulder"; the presence of such a being, he was convinced, "would be the centre of an atmosphere most wholesomely tonic." After that, it is perhaps not necessary to say anything further about Professor Stanley Hall and the girls. He received, it may be noted, little support from contemporary teachers in American schools.

In the early years of the present century, many of those working within the English public school system were beginning to have doubts, similar to Ennis Richmond's, about its sexual influence. A Winchester master, retiring after forty years' service, devoted his farewell address to declaring his conversion to the principles of coeducation. Lyttelton of Eton spoke of the tone of young men towards outcast women as "hard and brutally callous or frivolous, with a kind

of coarse frivolity not exhibited in relation to any other form of human suffering," and realized that there was " nothing whatever in their bringing up to counteract the claims of self, or to make them understand the woman's side of the question at all." He eventually became, as is well known, a vigorous champion of coeducation. Paton of Manchester Grammar School, in a booklet written in defence of the public school system, concedes that " when all is said and done, the English public school is not according to Nature, it is not a natural development "[1]; and he too did good service in later years to the cause of coeducation. Finally, Gray of Bradfield, who visited American schools as a member of the Moseley Commission of 1903, " unhesitatingly declared " of coeducation that " on the whole the advantages, both in day and boarding schools, far outweigh the disadvantages." It was, he thought, " vastly beneficial to boys and girls alike."[2] The Commission was by no means unanimous in its findings; but its members all agreed in noticing the democratic character of American schools, and in criticizing the large preponderance of women teachers (out of 439,596 public high school teachers in that year, 317,204 were women). In their discussion of discipline, they found that " one cause of good behaviour is the presence of girls along with the boys." Professor T. G. Foster observed that the

[1] J. L. Paton: *English Public Schools* (George Allen), 1905.
[2] For this and the quotations that follow see the *Report of the Moseley Educational Commission to the U.S.A.* (Co-operative Printing Society), 1904.

" relation of boys and girls in and out of school . . . appeared to be more natural than in this country," an observation which was shared by many of his colleagues. H. B. Gray found an " absolute absence of sexual strain," and Hubert Rathbone noted that the strongest opponents of coeducation were those who had not been coeducated themselves; he found the objections to it " groundless." To this broad agreement in approval there was, however, one rather violent dissentient in Professor Henry E. Armstrong; he was distressed to find that " the boy in America is not being brought up to punch another boy's head." He knew all about women and their proper place in the scheme of things: " Throughout the entire period of her existence woman has been man's slave . . . education can do little to modify her nature." At all events, as far as he was concerned, education was not going to be given the chance. (Professor Henry E. Armstrong was, it may be relevant to notice, a bachelor.)

The published conclusions of the Moseley Commission did something to further the cause of coeducation in England. The private protagonist in the struggle was Alice Woods, one-time principal of the Maria Grey Training College, who wrote and spoke tirelessly on behalf of coeducation from 1891 onwards, and edited two valuable symposia on the subject. She had started as a teacher at Chiswick High School in 1885, and at first knew little of coeducation after the age of twelve. But in 1901 she made expeditions to various parts of Hampshire,

Derbyshire and Lancashire, to see what was being done for the advance of coeducation in secondary schools. She found many experiments being carried out in total ignorance of the work of others, and was moved to publish her first collection of apologiae,[1] with an introduction by Michael Sadler, who declared himself "impressed but not fully convinced." The book contained a list of twenty-nine pioneer coeducational schools then (1903) in existence in England, four of them being Friends' schools. Later, during the Great War, she published[2] interesting accounts of visits to two bold coeducational experiments, the Junior George Republic in America and Homer Lane's Little Commonwealth in Dorsetshire. The former was a kind of reformatory, containing sixty-seven boys and thirty-nine girls between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one, living as a village community, self-governing and coeducational. There were eight other such republics already established in different States. Alice Woods found the coeducation there in many ways unsatisfactory, because not wholehearted enough. Genuine and much more successful coeducation among "difficult" children existed in the Little Commonwealth, which has been described in two books[3] that every orthodox teacher ought to read. (Unorthodox teachers have read them and continue to learn from Homer Lane, an

[1] *Coeducation*—see bibliography.
[2] In *Child Life* for January, May and October 1916.
[3] E. T. Bazeley: *Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth*, and Homer Lane: *Talks to Parents and Teachers*, both published by Allen and Unwin, 1928.

educator of rare genius.) Lane's "Be happy, and then you will be good" is a maxim whose truth most professional moralists are still very unwilling to recognize.

Meanwhile, the relations between the State or local education authorities and coeducation had been gradually improving, though they are curiously difficult to determine. As early as 1895 Commissioners had recognized some mixed schools as "practicable and successful"; the principal kinds of mixed school at that time were public elementary schools, higher grade schools which had developed out of these, and some pupil-teacher schools. Witnesses before the Commission "found the advantages considerable and the drawbacks unimportant." In their report they actually recommended the establishment of coeducational schools, and had "no fear of any undesirable consequences." Their motives appear to have been based largely on economy.

By 1901, about half the public elementary schools in England and Wales were coeducational: out of 31,502 departments, 15,504 were mixed. (In point of fact, probably less than half the children were really being coeducated, since the departments were of unequal size. The proportion of mixed departments was actually falling: in 1881 it had been 51·6 per cent., in 1891 49·4 per cent., and in 1901 it was 49·2 per cent.; but the number of children at mixed schools was slowly rising, and twenty years later (1923) more than two-thirds of all the children

receiving elementary education was doing so in mixed schools.) After the Education Act of 1902 there was a great increase of mixed secondary day schools of lower grade, under county or borough authorities, all over England, owing to two factors: the coeducational tradition of many of the higher grade board schools which thus developed into secondary schools, and—as usual—the desire for economy.

By 1905, out of 492 secondary schools (containing 85,358 pupils) recognized by the Board of Education for the receipt of Government grant, 108 schools (containing 21,720 pupils) were mixed; twenty schools (containing 8,980 pupils) were "dual"—the worst possible compromise, combining all the difficulties of coeducation with none of its advantages. Thus already a little over 25 per cent. of secondary schools in receipt of grant were mixed. But it should be remembered that the terms "mixed" and "dual" to some extent overlapped, and that this proportion needs to be balanced by the inclusion of the segregated private (known as "public") schools. The number of these was, and is, impossible to estimate accurately. In 1897, when the last enquiry giving full statistics was held, there were some 5,000 private schools outside State control, of which 970 (containing 26,027 pupils) were at that time mixed; the great majority of these children were, however, under twelve years of age, and only 5,488 adolescent children were, according to the 1897 returns, being privately coeducated.

In Wales, for the year (1905) which we have taken as a landmark, the proportion of mixed schools was much higher: out of eighty-four State-aided secondary schools, eleven were mixed and forty-four dual. Out of 9,340 pupils, 1,457 (or 15 per cent.) were in mixed, and 5,085 (or 54 per cent.) in dual schools. In point of fact, " dual " schools very often meant, in Welsh practice, genuine mixed schools. Thus in England and Wales together, there were in 1905 183 mixed or dual schools (mostly really mixed) on the Board of Education's " efficient " test; in 1914 the number had increased by more than 50 per cent. to 285; in 1922 it was 338, and in 1926 361, of which 234 were provided by county authorities, seventy were endowed schools, and fifty-seven Welsh intermediate schools, coeducating between them 100,000 girls and boys, or about one quarter of the total number of children receiving " efficient " secondary education. In this year, then, two boys out of every seven receiving secondary education in England and Wales, were doing so in schools to which girls were admitted. The proportion of mixed elementary schools had also grown strikingly. In the same year there were 250 senior mixed and 1,615 junior mixed elementary schools, and 14,728 classified as " mixed," educating between them well over two million children. If infants are included, more than three million boys and girls were thus receiving elementary coeducation. (The most recent figures will be found at the end of chapter IX.) At no time can the Board be said to

have encouraged this progress of coeducation; it merely did not oppose it.

In Scotland, shortly before the Great War (1913), of fifty-seven secondary schools receiving the highest grant, eleven were for boys only, six for girls only, and forty were mixed. Of 195 higher grade schools, 186 were open to both sexes. After the war (1919), of the 1,080 secondary schools recognized as efficient, 224 were mixed.

In 1921 an attempt was made by the teaching profession to educate official State policy in this matter: the Mixed Schools Committee of the Incorporated Association of Headmasters (a body representing 814 schools, 300 of which were mixed) brought the case for coeducation before the Board of Education, the local authorities and the general public, in a pamphlet.[1] They complained, with some reason, that the assumption that coeducational schools had been founded for reasons of economy only, had biased both public opinion and official administration. They declared that the "dangers were more imaginary than real," and asked for fair play and free choice of school by the parent—"if parents should ultimately prefer the departmental type, the mixed schools would diminish and die out, but they should not be killed administratively, or die from innuendo." They made the good point that "there should be some members of the Board's inspecting staff appointed by reason of their special

[1] *The Case for Coeducation in Secondary Schools* (I.A.H.M.), 1921, revised 1923.

knowledge of the work of coeducational schools, and some understanding of and sympathy with the special problems they attack." They welcomed the report of the Committee on the Differentiation of Curricula, which did, as we have seen, contain by the way much evidence in support of their cause.

The famous "Hadow Report" of 1926[1] gave no help. It might be supposed that one subject worth discussing in connection with the education of adolescents was the extent to which the sexes should be brought up together. But apart from hinting at their lack of sympathy with mixed post-primary schools, the Committee did not refer to the subject at all. Their much more helpful report of 1923 has already been considered fairly fully; and they returned to the subject a few years later, in dealing with the primary school.[2] They wrote that "sex differences in educable capacity up to the age of eleven appear to be negligible"—a conclusion sufficiently established in their previous findings; they observed that "girls are more ready to pass moral judgment, usually of blame, than boys"; and they considered that the physiological evidence (the different rates of skeletal development, and the like) pointed to the "desirability, even at this early stage, of different games and physical exercises" for girls and boys respectively. On the whole they felt that

[1] *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Education of the Adolescent* (H.M. Stationery Office), 1926.

[2] *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Primary School* (H.M. Stationery Office), 1931.

there was "no valid objection on general sociological and educational grounds to mixed primary schools, provided that due regard be paid to the differing needs of the boys and girls in the matter of games and physical exercises." (In that year, 1931, of 2,518 departments in England and Wales classified as "junior," 2,265 were mixed.) Their latest report, the "Spens Report," [1] contains no mention of coeducation.

In fairness to the Board of Education, one ought to remember that it does not, of course, dictate educational policy in this country; the most it can do is to recommend it. Control is exercised, in the final analysis, by the finance committees of the local education authorities, and to a certain extent by the decision of the Board to give or withhold approval of schemes involving a grant. But the Consultative Committee have done so much to guide wisely the development of the national system of education—in every one of their reports there are good things, and their historical perspective is always admirable—that it is much to be hoped that they will soon turn their attention to the question of coeducation. Although much of this book is devoted to the coeducational work of the private pioneer schools, it must be recognized that the cause of coeducation will ultimately be won or lost in the State schools. The private schools have done, and are still doing, the most important experimental work, chiefly because

[1] *Report of the Consultative Committee on Secondary Education* (H.M. Stationery Office), 1938.

of the peculiar independence they enjoy; but for the building of a humane democracy it is the State schools that finally matter most. It is possible to paint two quite different pictures of the condition of coeducation inside the State schools: the statistics quoted above show the steady growth in the numbers of children receiving mixed education, but it may equally well be held that genuine coeducation in these schools is very rare. Coeducation is not combined instruction of the sexes, but a very full cooperation of boys and girls in work, games and leisure. Concurrent herding of the sexes in the classroom and separating them in the playground may easily be doing more harm than good, from the coeducational point of view. It has been held that genuine coeducation is possible only in the heuristic atmosphere of a freely organized private school; but many State-controlled schools contrive to be freely organized, and some are certainly pursuing genuine coeducation. Practice here varies enormously, and there is among the heads of mixed schools the completest variation of outlook. The London County Council, for instance, has tended to regard coeducation as a *pis aller*; it has permitted mixed schools mainly for reasons of economy, but preserves a remarkable reticence on the real merits of this "controversial" subject, which it regards as one upon which "it is not advisable to express an opinion." In some counties, notably in Kent, there has been a tendency to convert such mixed secondary schools as exist at present into two segregated schools,

and abandon coeducation altogether. (There are very few, if any, mixed secondary schools in Kent today.) This does not necessarily imply official disapproval of coeducation in theory; a recent Director of Education in Kent,[1] indeed, was fully alive to its advantages, but found it impossible to obtain enough properly qualified teachers. It is true that in other counties the opposite policy is at work—the combination of two segregated schools. But in so far as this is done in order to save a building and a head's salary, and the children (and teachers) remain in separate rooms, the cause of coeducation is ill served. Even in Scotland, with its long co-educational tradition, the children often join together in classrooms under rigid supervision. The best work in State school coeducation is to be found in Wales, where very many of the heads both realize what they are doing, and believe in it.

[1] Mr. E. S. Davies, whose testimony is quoted in A. Lloyd's *Years Between*—see bibliography.

CHAPTER VIII

THE NEW SCHOOL

If coeducation is linked, on one side, with the movement for women's education, it is on the other side inseparable from the New School movement. The three things overlap each other. Not all the pioneers of women's education believed either in coeducation or in the New School; not all the pioneers of the New School believed in women's education or coeducation; but it is probably true to say that in the main, those who have worked for coeducation have been believers both in "feminism" and in "progressive education." (The inverted commas are tiresome, but necessary as a reminder that the terms involved are extremely unsatisfactory.) They tend, that is to say, to believe that feminism and progressive educational methods find their fullest realization in the common upbringing of girls and boys, and that the common upbringing of girls and boys is most effectively carried out by those who believe in the equality of the sexes and an unorthodox approach to educational technique.

The history of the New School has yet to be written, and this is not the place for it to be done. Much of it lies in the files of the various journals of

progressive education, notably *The New Era*, *Pour L'Ère Nouvelle*, and *Das Werdende Zeitalter*, and is difficult to get at. Yet some understanding of it is essential for seeing modern coeducation in its proper perspective. The "crank school" does not begin with A. S. Neill: it has roots going back almost to the Reformation. Broadly speaking, the New School movement means—or meant—the return to Nature as educator; the realization that every child has within itself the instincts, energies and machinery of growth necessary to become a fully developed and happy adult being; the consciousness that the failures of the art of education are the history of successive thwartings of Nature. Man has interfered with Nature in the field of science with good effect; in the field of education his interference has been disastrous. His manner of educating his children is the measure of his respect for Nature's way of growing. Such, crudely put—and necessarily exaggerating the anthropomorphism implicit in such a view of Nature—were the aims that inspired the revolt against the educational methods of scholasticism.

The methods of the art of education had always been empirical, and its aims varied: emphasis had been laid on the acquiring of knowledge, or on moral security, or on physical fitness, and arguments found for the supreme importance of each. The New Education endeavoured to embrace them all, upholding no particular "right technique," believing the way of teaching to be less important than the way of learning. The emphasis which had for so long

been purely didascolocentric was now to be permanently shifted to the child. The school reformers insisted that they had no method except a return to Nature; they gave no character to the child, but rather allowed it to develop one; they did not thrust intellectual notions into its head, but rather put it in the way of conquering them for itself.[1] The aim of the school, they believed, was not learning but life, and its problem was the reconciling of two diverse but surely not incompatible aims: the development of the individual and the creation of a healthy society—the encouragement of real independence of thought and action, and the acquiring at the same time of knowledge and self-discipline through community life. What they valued most was the spontaneous activity of the child, something individual and creative which was the happiest augury of healthy growth. Now, all this is liable to exaggeration as an educational method—or as a protest against method; and it has, in fact, been so exaggerated. But it does contain a truth which for centuries had been obscured, and perhaps this truth lies at the very centre of education. All the intuitive educational geniuses of the past have known it, and expressed it in their several ways: it is that the child grows as a plant grows, according to its own internal laws, and that it most truly possesses what it itself experiences. The child is not, in fact, merely an incomplete adult, but a creature *sui generis*; and

[1] This view is well expounded in Adolphe Ferrière: *Projet d'École Nouvelle* (Neuchâtel), 1909.

youth is a form of life, complete and absolutely valuable in itself. If it be true that ontogeny epitomizes phylogeny, the educational process may be a very long one—the human race has taken its time to grow, and so must the individual who recapitulates that slow and incompletely realized process of becoming. But that child is most likely to become a true adult who has most truly grown; and to be a good civilized man it must once have been a good savage.

As early as the beginning of the sixteenth century this educational protest was beginning to make itself heard. Luther had a horror of the schools of his time, which he characterized as prisons, and their teachers as tyrants. (He had himself been beaten fifteen times in one morning.) He stressed the importance of the individual child and of its personal liberty. "One should bring up children," he said, "in a manner conformable to their age, and as it were by playing." That last phrase reveals Luther as a real educator; there were—and still are—all too many teachers who believe that the sole criterion of educational value in a method or a subject is, that it shall be sufficiently unpleasant to the educand. In criticizing contemporary forms of punishment, Luther said: "Quodlibet regimen debet observare discrimen ingeniorum"—and that too is something which might be noted by the sentimental floggers of our own day: you cannot simply beat a body, you are beating a person. In the same age Rabelais was writing some pungent reflections upon the schools of his time, whose "sapience n'estoit que moufles,

abastardissant les bons et nobles esprits et corrompant toute fleur de jeunesse." [1] Montaigne's *Essais* (1580) show something of the same revolt against bookishness; he protested against the conception of education as mere memory exercises—" sçavoir par coeur n'est pas sçavoir! "

Meanwhile in England the same protest was being made with no less vigour, if with no greater success. The Elizabethan Richard Mulcaster, first headmaster of Merchant Taylor's, has never received his proper measure of recognition as an educational reformer. Almost all the germs of the New School may be found in his *Positions* (1581), which treat of the necessity for educating mind and body together, of adapting instruction to mental age, of the importance of the early days in the child's schooling, of the folly of intellectual pressure, of the wisdom of thorough training in the mother tongue, of the need for girls' education and teachers' training colleges.[2] (It took something like three hundred years for the importance of these last two points to be recognized.)

In education, as in almost every other matter, one cannot explore very far without coming up against Goethe, greatest of humanists. The man who wrote " Everywhere, we learn only from those we love " may not have been thinking specifically of education; but the sayings about the bringing up of children which are scattered throughout his works reveal an

[1] *Gargantua et Pantagruel* I, xv.

[2] A full account is given of Mulcaster, and of some other pioneers here described, in R. H. Quick's *Educational Reformers* (Longmans, Green), 1890.

astonishing grasp of education as a dynamic function of growth—though astonishing is always a wrong word to use of Goethe. The views which he expresses in *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*[1] were partly the result of Rousseau's influence, partly the outcome of a visit to Hofwyl, to the school kept by Fellenberg, a fervent disciple of Pestalozzi and of Rousseau himself. In this great and unequal work of his old age, Goethe's mind was preoccupied, as the mind of the aged Plato had been before him, above everything else with education, religion and ethics; and the story of the *pädagogische Provinz* is a myth worthy of the Greek philosopher.

Rousseau was by no means the isolated phenomenon that he is sometimes represented as being; nor was his celebrated *Émile* (1762) a matter of parthenogenesis—its educational doctrine of "natural education" may be traced back through Locke and Montaigne to Rabelais. But Rousseau himself was so quintessentially the child of his age that it was as if *Émile* uttered a new truth to mankind. His general rule—"do the opposite to what is usually done"—and his whole conception of "negative education" were much more than the perversity which at first they sound. Rousseau did see clearly the value of childhood as a state in itself, and the importance of basing education upon interest and action; and so long as schools exist his name will not be forgotten. Enough explosive was lying about the educational system of the day—even in Germany Kant was demanding not slow reform but a rapid revolution

[1] Bk. II, ch. 1, 2, 8.

in the schools—so that it only needed Rousseau's match to blow the thing sky high. From that explosion the dust is still settling today—even to some extent obscuring the light.

The Swiss Pestalozzi was the first well-known educator to practise the new doctrines; but there had been others doing his work even before him. The German Utopist Wolfgang Ratichius (1571-1635), although he was as incompetent an organizer as Pestalozzi himself—and that is saying much—had conducted a bold educational experiment whose aim was in all things to "follow Nature." It was a failure, of course; the path that leads to Nature's sanctuary often lands us up in a trackless bog. But it may have brought some happiness to a few children. Another short-lived attempt at the ideal community was that of Planta at Zisers in 1761—the gospel of Émile in operation a year before the book was actually published. Basedow's Philanthropinum was another attempt in the direct line of the ancestry of "crank schools." The son of a Hamburg perruke-maker, thick-skinned and crude in character, a man who was never known to go to bed by night and was seldom approachable by day because of the vile tobacco that he smoked, Basedow was a wholehearted admirer of Rousseau. He knew Goethe well—all students of Goethe will remember the celebrated journey on the Rhine with the poet as "das Weltkind in der Mitten" between Basedow and the physiognomist Lavater. The Philanthropinum was opened in 1771 at Dessau, to educate the

young "according to Nature," with no suppression at all; it was closed in 1793. Pestalozzi himself, as we have seen, made different attempts to found the ideal school, at first with his wife at Neuhof, later at Stanz, where Froebel was an interested visitor. His work cannot be adequately summed up in a paragraph, or in a chapter; it must be sufficient to say that the man who believed so firmly in education through the senses, and in the value of the family as an educational unit, who wrote that "the essential principle of education is not teaching but love," was one of the most important architects of the New School.

In Germany educational reform was in the air. Fichte, in the ninth discourse of his famous *Reden an die deutsche Nation* (1808) was demanding re-orientation of the schools, and Jean Paul Richter was even looking forward to the common upbringing of the sexes—"Mischt die Geschlechter um sie aufzuheben!"[1] It was left to Froebel to work out the experiment with children, in the first true kindergarten. (He did well to be proud of having found such a pleasant name for such a pleasant thing; these institutions had previously been known as *Kleinkinderbeschäftigungsanstalten*.) Froebel's belief in the action of young people, in the value of the creative formative instinct in the child, was something that was permanently to enrich the New Education.

When the New School finally came, there were three distinctively national contributions made

[1] *Levana oder Erziehlehre*, § 129.

towards what became an international movement. The earliest in time was the English contribution, and the beginnings of the New School movement may fairly be dated from 1889, when Cecil Reddie founded Abbotsholme in Derbyshire, four years before Bedales was opened. Abbotsholme was—and is—no believer in coeducation, but its influence upon the development of experimental education throughout Europe is undoubted. And our language has given two terms—coeducation and self-government—to international pedagogic terminology. The chief breaks with English public school tradition were the jettisoning of a classical curriculum, the introduction of a considerable amount of manual work and out-of-door activities, the lessening of the importance of games and the broadening of the religious basis of school life. That belief in the child as an organic whole which was implicit in the teachings of all the forerunners of the New School mentioned above, began to be expressed in actual school practice. Abbotsholme and its daughter schools felt themselves to be laboratories of education: not models of the school of the future, but places of experiment. Their conditions were often exceptional, as was—inevitably—their human material. Early examples of the English New School were Ruskin House, Heacham, Norfolk (1899), the Priory School, King's Langley, Herts (1900), the Home School, Grindleford, Derbyshire (1910), and the Caldecott Community, Cheshunt, Herts (1911).[1]

[1] Ferrière gives a full list in *Pour L'Ère Nouvelle* for April 1925.

The English New School became in Germany the *Landerziehungsheim*. It was planted in fertile soil; the progress of the *Arbeitsschulen* under the influence of Gandig and Kerschensteiner of Munich had shown that the moment for a decisive break with over-intellectualized education was at hand. The country was seething with various experiments in pedagogic method. In 1898 Hermann Lietz came straight from Abbotsholme, where he had been teaching on the staff, and founded the first *Landerziehungsheim* at Ilsenburg in the Harz district. There followed Haubinda in Thuringia (1901), Bieberstein on the Rhine (1904) and Buchenau (1924). Lietz was a real pioneer in German education; he saw that the old conception of the *Unterrichtsschule* must give place to the *Erziehungsschule*, but he never reached the point of coeducation. All his schools were segregated, or contained a mere handful of girls. It was left to Gustav Wyneken to found in 1906 the first coeducational New School in Germany, the Freie Schulgemeinde Wickersdorf, whose daughter schools —Hermann Harless' Nordsee Pedagogium (1908), the Landschulheim am Solling (1909), Paul Geheeb's Odenwaldschule (1910), the Freie Schul- und Werkgemeinschaft Letzlingen (1919), and Martin Luserke's Schule am Meer on the island of Juist (1924)—all of them coeducational, were extraordinarily vigorous and successful. Wyneken himself had taught under Lietz at Ilsenburg in 1900, and had stayed as headmaster when Lietz went away to found Haubinda; Wickersdorf, which he established

in friendship with Geheeb and August Halm the music critic, was for years a storm centre for accusations of immorality and irreligion, denunciations, quarrellings and secessions—the Germans have a marvellous incapacity for mutual toleration—a place of pilgrimage for educationists from every continent, and a gold mine of "copy" for novelists; but it survived, and kept its remarkable musical and literary culture alive until Hitler came to trample on music, literature and free education with ruthless impartiality.

In its early segregated days, Bedales was visited by the celebrated French sociologist Edmond Demolins, who quickly developed into one of the most fervent propagandists of the New School idea. One book in particular[1] obtained a very wide circulation, and may be said to have plotted the course of the New Education in France. It was an attempt at social classification, and dealt respectively with the *formation communautaire* of the Latin, and the *formation particulariste* of the Anglo-Saxon peoples; the one, he said, was based on a tendency to rely on the community, group, family, tribe or clan (and was in origin a typically Eastern formation), the other was based on reliance upon self, and the triumph of the private over the public man. The thesis was carefully worked out, and implied a devastating criticism of French educational methods. In 1899 Demolins founded the famous École des Roches at Verneuil in

[1] E. Demolins: *A quoi tient la superiorité des Anglo Saxons?* (Paris), 1897—surely a very attractive and endearing title.

Normandy, to carry the spirit of Reddie and Badley across the Channel.[1] The scope of the *écoles nouvelles à la campagne* was always limited, because of the preparation necessary for the *baccalaureat*; but they did some courageous and valuable work. The École des Roches, directed for more than twenty years by Georges Bertier, was followed by Scott's École de l'Ile de France at Liancourt (1901), Duhamel's Collège de Normandie at Clères near Rouen (1902), Ernest Contou's École de l'Aquitaine at Chalais, and many ephemeral foundations, all of them segregated. Perhaps the most interesting coeducational venture in France was Paul Robin's ill-starred orphanage (1880-94) at Cempuis dans l'Oise.[2] Here an individual genius showed what might be accomplished even under State supervision and control.

In Switzerland Robert Seidel was the prophet, and Ed. Oertli the first architect, of the New School. Grünau, its first representative, was established in 1867. In conjunction with Dr. Frei, Werner Zuberbühler founded the first Swiss *Landerziehungsheim* at Glarisegg, Lake Constance, in 1902; Tobler's coeducational Hof Oberkirch Schule, and the École Nouvelle de la Swisse Romande at Chailly, Lausanne, followed in 1906; and the country of Rousseau and Pestalozzi saw a whole succession of schools owing much to their teaching, with their

[1] See E. Demolins: *L'Éducation Nouvelle* (Paris), 1899, which contains accounts of Abbotsholme and Bedales, thinly disguised under initials, and what amounts to an enlarged prospectus of his own school.

[2] An account of it is given in Gabriel Giroud: *Cempuis* (Paris), 1900.

emphasis on the spontaneity of the child, on personal initiative, manual work, self-government and family life. The best known of later foundations was, perhaps, the Fellowship School at Gland, Vaud (1921), which believed in internationalism, pacifism, vegetarianism, and a "natural life."

In Belgium, the celebrated coeducational Orphelinat Rationaliste was founded at Brussels in 1893 (to be re-founded in 1920). The chief propagandist for the New Education was Decroly, the pathology expert whose *Institut* was founded at Brussels in 1901, and Omer Buyse, director of a school at Charleroi. The most famous experimental school was that of Faria de Vasconcellos, Professor of psychology and pedagogy in the New University of Brussels, which he founded at Bierges-lez-Wawre (1912); it lasted only two years and was ruined by the war.[1] In Holland, Jan Ligthart (1859-1916) directed a great pioneer school at The Hague, based mainly on manual training, and the most important later foundations were the Pythagoras School at Ommen (1920) and Kees Boeke's Children's Workshop Community at Bilthoven (1929).

In Sweden the *Slöjd* (manual) School at Nääs, founded by August Abrahamson in 1872, was the pioneer of the New School in the country, with an anti-intellectualist bias. Sven Lönborg's Högre Samskola was coeducational up till the age of eighteen. In Russia Tolstoy was labouring to become

[1] Faria de Vasconcellos: *La Nouvelle École en Belgique* (Neuchâtel), 1915.

a good schoolmaster, and to express his admiration for Rousseau's educational methods in three successive attempts to found a school at Yasnaya Polyana[1] in 1859, 1861 and 1872. Had "negative education" been Rousseau's only prescription, he might have had a measure of success.

In Italy Maria Montessori's influence was naturally the chief educational force during the early years of the present century. In Spain the most interesting pioneer schools were the Fundacion Horaciana of Pablo Vila at Barcelona, and the Colegio Mont d'Or founded by P. Moles at Terrasa near Barcelona in 1905. Many such similar attempts were short-lived, but one of them deserves special mention—Francisco Ferrer y Guardia's Modern School at Barcelona.[2] Ferrer was a rationalist, anarchist and pacifist who persuaded a French Catholic, Mlle Meunier, to give money to endow his "institute of rational education," which was opened in 1901 with twelve girls and eighteen boys. The school was for all social classes, and provided no rewards or punishments. Ferrer was found guilty in 1909 of leading a civil insurrection, and after a sensational trial (in England, William Archer among others laboured tirelessly to avert what seemed to very many people a plain judicial murder) he was shot.

The educational emphasis in the New School movement fell rather differently in different

[1] A full account will be found in Aylmer Maude: *Life of Tolstoy* (Constable), 1908-10.

[2] Francisco Ferrer: *The origin and ideals of the Modern School* (Watts & Co.), 1913.

countries: broadly speaking, in England (the true original home of the movement) it was on self-government, and abroad on manual work. The term *école active*, unknown in 1918 and now widely current on the continent, was coined by Pierre Bouvet, Director of the Institut J. J. Rousseau at Geneva in 1919, to describe all schools in which the child was regarded as an active organism. The distinguished Swiss sociologist Adolphe Ferrière had been long writing of such schools as *écoles du travail*, but they had in fact little in common with the manual training schools suggested by that term: they were, as we have seen, simply a reaction against the medieval conception of school, against its formalism, its misunderstanding of the essential character of the growing child. They claimed to be not anti-intellectual, but anti-intellectualist—opposed to giving intellect a preponderant place in children's lives. In 1899 the Bureau International des Écoles Nouvelles was inaugurated—later to be reorganized (1912) with headquarters at Les Pléiades sur Blonay, in Switzerland—for mutual aid, collection of statistics and the centralization of literature concerning the New Schools. Of this Institute Ferrière was for some years Director, and in his book *L'École Active*[1] he promulgated his own conception of what these schools should be. The minimum requirements for a New School he held to be: situation in the country, instruction based on experience and enriched by

[1] Ad. Ferrière: *L'École Active*, 2 vols. (Editions Forum, Neuchâtel), 1922. To this I am indebted for much of the historical information given above.

manual work, self-government, and not less than half the thirty characteristics which he listed. These characteristics[1] give such a clear picture of the continental idea of the New School that they are worth reproducing in abbreviated form. The ten general characteristics are (i) the School as a laboratory of practical pedagogy, pioneering on behalf of State schools, and in touch with modern psychology; (ii) the School as a boarding establishment; (iii) situation in the country (but not very far from a town), to provide opportunities for gardening and agricultural work; (iv) separate house groups for the pupils, run by men and women conjointly, with as much atmosphere of the family, and as little of the barracks, as possible; (v) coeducation, (vi) manual work every day, for its educational value and not with an eye to a future trade; (vii) carpentry, digging, and rearing of small animals; (viii) much time for spare-time occupations, left to the pupil's private taste; (ix) " natural " gymnastics, performed naked to the waist; (x) excursions and camping out, with meals prepared by the pupils themselves. The ten characteristics of mental education are (i) general cultivation of judgment rather than accumulation of knowledge, not so much instruction as help in finding out; (ii) specialized training to reinforce this, the cultivation of the preponderant tastes of the pupils; (iii) teaching based on experiment and personal observation, instruction in theory always following instruction in

[1] Set forth in his preface to Faria's book, see p. 124 footnote.

practice; (iv) personal activity of the pupil—e.g. association of drawing with intellectual studies; (v) instruction based on spontaneous interests, conforming to the age of the child; (vi) individual work—private research, children's lectures in class, and so on; (vii) collective work among pupils; (viii) instruction restricted to morning hours, preparation in the evening—and then not for juniors; (ix) not more than two subjects studied in any one day; (x) only a few subjects taken in any one month or term. (These last two points refer to Paul Geheeb's *Kurssystem*, which Ferrière personally admired.) The ten characteristics of moral education are (i) self-government; (ii) elected school officials; (iii) school duties undertaken by all, for the realization of the principal of mutual aid; (iv) rewards consisting of opportunities for increased creativeness; (v) punishments having a direct relation to the fault committed; (vi) academic emulation through comparison with the pupil's own work at other times, not comparison with other's work; (vii) an environment charged with beauty; (viii) concerted music, choral and instrumental, shared by all; (ix) education of the moral conscience through good reading; (x) education of the practical reason apart from definite religious creeds. This manifesto is very obviously of its time—one seems to see the New Schoolmaster in his Norfolk jacket, knickerbockers and boots, with the well-thumbed copy of *Towards Democracy* bulging his pocket, as one reads through the list. But it gives not a bad composite picture of

what the New School was trying to be. Ferrière actually gave " marks " to different schools, according as they fulfilled his requirements; the Odenwaldschule alone scored 30, but Bedales does quite well with 25, and Abbotsholme is a good third with 22½ (if such comparison is not an infringement of characteristic (vi) of moral education). Eton College would seem to score about 8 points.

Ferrière found that in 1922 there were thirty New Schools in English-speaking countries, twenty in German-speaking countries, eleven in French-speaking countries, and two elsewhere, about half the whole number being coeducational; but nearly half the thirty in the first group were in the U.S.A., and some were doubtful specimens as coeducational schools. Pioneer schools in that country are too numerous to mention; ever since the foundation of John Dewey's school in 1896, America has been the home of all kinds of educational experiment. The manual work which Ferrière so greatly stressed was always a distinguishing feature of the English New School, but never the central one that he felt it ought to be, though a Board of Education report[1] did make some very sound recommendations in that direction, which were afterwards incorporated in the Education Act of 1913. At its most enthusiastic, Ferrière's writing is little else than a scolding of those schools whose pupils stray far from the carpenter's shop or the toolshed.

[1] *Report of the Consultative Committee on practical work in Secondary Schools* (H.M. Stationery Office), 1913.

CHAPTER IX

COEDUCATION IN OTHER COUNTRIES

THE figures that follow have been compiled from several sources: from the handbook of the Bureau International d'Éducation,[1] from yearbooks and education reports, from the statistical departments of the Governments of the countries concerned, and from numerous private individuals. They represent, in all cases, the latest figures available, though in some cases they may be as much as three years old. As may be supposed, practice varies very considerably according to the prevailing form of religious obedience in a country: Protestantism generally inclines to coeducation, and Catholicism against it—though there are striking exceptions. The official attitude of the Catholic Church is not open to question; it was clearly set forth in an encyclical in 1929,[2] which incidentally condemns "every form of pedagogic naturalism"—that is, the entire New School movement. Coeducation, the Church holds, is "founded upon naturalism and the denial of original sin," and the association of the sexes in

[1] *Annuaire International de l'Éducation et de l'Enseignement* (Geneva), 1938.

[2] The encyclical letter *Divini illius magistri* of His Holiness Pius XI.

youth appears as a "levelling promiscuity." The differences of sex "ought to be maintained and encouraged during their years of formation . . . and in gymnastic exercises and deportment, special care must be had of Christian modesty in young women and girls." This section of the encyclical closes with some "terrible words of the divine Master" [1] which are made, somewhat curiously, to refer to the "pernicious errors" of coeducation. (In another section of the encyclical, St. Basil is quoted, with approval, as an educationist; this is also curious, since the religious schools established under his rule were often coeducational, up to sixteen or seventeen years of age.)

France. "Coéducation en France," says the educationist writer Charles Letourneau, "n'a cessé, depuis le Moyen âge, de nous sembler horriblement dangereux et immorale." The French educational system, more perhaps than any other, needs to be considered against its historical background, so strong is the instinctive traditionalism of the country; and this there is no time to do adequately here. Two important sources of tradition were those of the Jesuits and the Jansenists, bitterly opposed to each other. The Jesuit *Ratio Studiorum*, drawn up in 1599 by an international committee of six, provided a narrow but in many ways excellent intellectual training (Descartes, one of their most distinguished pupils, pays warm tribute to his Jesuit teachers in

[1] "Vae mundo a scandalis!"—Matt. xviii, 7.

the *Discours de la Méthode*), which persisted unaltered until it was first revised in 1832, and influenced many schools. The other strong influence proceeded from the Jansenist "Little Schools" of Port Royal, inspired by the Abbé de Saint Cyran; their emphasis was on literary training, small groups of children, and an atmosphere of home life.[1] They lasted barely fifteen years (1646-61), and were eventually crushed by Jesuit pressure, but they influenced French education ever since. The modern State educational scheme is based largely on that submitted by Condorcet to the Legislative Assembly in 1798. The choice of elementary schools in country districts today rests in the hands of the local *maire*, who decides upon a mixed or segregated school in accordance with the people's wishes. Boys and girls take exactly the same curriculum, but mostly in separate schools. At present there are 22,093 primary schools for boys, 22,088 for girls, and 25,125 are mixed. Of the intermediate schools 297 are for boys, 224 for girls, and none are mixed. Of secondary schools 348 are for boys, 196 for girls, and 2 are mixed. There appears to be a single coeducational boarding school, that of Mlles Soubeyran and Monnier at Beauvallon. In the upper classes of the *lycées*, girls who take the second part of the *baccalaureat* (philosophy and mathematics) may enter a class in the boys' *lycée* if the number of girls does not justify the creation of a class in their own institution. They do not appear

[1] For a full account, see H. C. Barnard: *The Little Schools of Port Royal* (Cambridge), 1913.

to have undermined the social fabric of the country to any serious extent, and we learn that "leur présence n'a pas causé le moindre trouble." Furthermore, the first Lycée Français in London was a fully coeducational establishment, with a woman principal.

Belgium. Of the State primary schools 2,394 are for boys, 1,324 for girls, and 1,450 are mixed; and of the private primary schools 894 are for boys, 1,559 for girls, and 993 are mixed. Thus well over two-thirds even of the primary schools are segregated; and there appear to be no mixed intermediate or secondary schools at all.

Holland. Coeducation was first permitted in 1871, and by 1886 it had become general in all State schools—gymnasia, *lycées* and craft schools. In 1914 it became universal in public-provided secondary schools, separate classes continuing only in Catholic and private schools. At present, of the 7,175 elementary schools 13 per cent. are for boys only, 13 per cent. for girls only, and 74 per cent. are mixed. (The religious division is distinct: Protestant schools are 99·5 per cent. mixed, while Catholic ones are 73·7 per cent. segregated.) Of the 778 secondary schools 13 per cent. are for boys only, 21 per cent. for girls only, and 66 per cent. are mixed. (Here again there is a clear-cut religious division: the Protestant schools are 95 per cent. mixed, and the Catholic ones 82 per cent. segregated.)

Switzerland. No exact figures are available, since there are twenty-five completely different sovereign cantonal school systems. In primary schools

coeducation is usual, but in the towns and larger country districts the division of large classes is often made according to sex, especially in the upper classes of primary schools. In secondary schools, segregation is usual on principle, though some smaller country districts have mixed secondary schools. A few private New Schools have adopted coeducation.

Italy. In the 'nineties, upon the suppression of many convents, requests were granted for the admission of girls to a *lycée* in Turin. The experiment was successful, and was widely copied in North Italy, then in Naples and later in the South. Thus the principle of coeducation was accepted, with little opposition, before 1900: the individual girl who wanted more than elementary teaching applied for and obtained permission to attend the local boys' secondary school. By 1910 there were 23 gymnasia for boys only, and 268 for boys and girls; and of the *lycées* 24 were for boys only, and 135 for boys and girls. By 1914 90 per cent. of secondary schools were open to girls, but only for instruction; above the age of twelve the sexes always sat on separate benches, and there was no social mixing. In 1909 Italian universities established joint classes for men and women, and made arrangements for mixed teachers' courses.

Spain. As early as 1889 there existed in Madrid the coeducational Institucion Libre de Ensenanzo, and Francisco Ferrer's famous Modern School, described in the previous chapter, was founded at Barcelona in 1901. During the early years of the present century

coeducation flourished in many country districts, though it was not encouraged in the large towns. Largely by accident, the State educational system became broadly coeducational, girls being gradually admitted to boys' schools as the movement for female education advanced, while only a few elementary schools remained segregational. The private schools, on the other hand, were for the most part strictly segregational—but these were Church-controlled. Women were early admitted to the universities, but few went.

Portugal. Surprisingly, a high degree of coeducation exists in this country. Of the State primary schools, 2,584 are for boys only, 2,523 for girls only, and 2,765 are mixed. (These figures, which refer to 1936, are only roughly accurate, for since that date a vast scheme of school development has been taking place.) There is one State secondary school for boys and one for girls, while the remaining 40 are mixed. Thus, by an interesting reversal of the usual policy, one-third of the primary and almost all the secondary education of the country is coeducational.

Germany. In most of the States of the old Germany (though not in Bavaria or Prussia) permission was given, at various dates from 1901 onwards, to enable girls up to the number of 10 per cent. to enter boys' higher secondary schools. They were removed if they failed to pass the terminal examination. In 1909 the total number of girls so admitted only amounted to 3,000, and only 4 per cent. of university students in that year were women. In 1910 the

Prussian Government allowed *Mittelschulen* (up to the age of fifteen or sixteen) to receive boys or girls, when they were not filled with the sex for which they were built, and to teach them together; and some 25,000 girls were so admitted to boys' schools. In 1912 there were altogether 600 schools to which they were admitted, chiefly in Baden, Hesse and Würtemburg. This was coinstruction rather than coeducation (the Germans have always been careful to distinguish between the two terms); the sexes did not even sit together, and the girls' entrance was subject to strictly regulated physical, intellectual and moral qualifications. Mixed primary schools were common, up to fourteen years, but in general there was little provision for the higher education of girls, because there was no effective "woman's movement" in the country. A few girls were admitted to gymnasia, and some of them did notably well. In 1918 there was some progress in coeducation in the more democratic areas such as Berlin, Hamburg and Saxony, with varying degrees of success. Evening high schools normally admitted both sexes. By 1922 nearly two-thirds of all *Volksschulen* (elementary schools) had mixed education.

In Nazi Germany "the education of the sexes is, on principle, separate, though in cases of need, by special permission, a few girls are sometimes included in boys' classes, and vice versa." In the 51,739 State primary schools there are 34,055 boys' classes, 33,905 girls' classes, and 123,193 mixed classes (mostly in country districts)—but these last are for

coinstruction only. A mere handful of private primary schools exists. Of State secondary schools 1,519 are for boys, 529 for girls, and none are mixed; of private secondary schools 71 are for boys, 184 for girls, and none are mixed. Some vestiges of coeducation still linger in a limited, barely tolerated fashion: a few girls—chiefly the daughters of teachers, and the like—remain in private *Landerziehungsheime* such as Schondorf am Ammersee, Holzminden and Marienau. In all Youth organizations the sexes are kept strictly separate.

Central Europe, the Balkans and the Near East: Albania. Of the primary schools 155 were until recently for boys, 25 for girls, and 418 were mixed. The intermediate and secondary schools were about half segregated and half mixed.

Bulgaria. Coeducation here is a matter of firm public policy, based not on expediency but on principle; and we learn that it has been " a guiding principle in the history of Bulgaria, and all educational factors, including enlightened public opinion, the whole body of teachers, and the educational authorities, are in favour of it." All the 4,725 primary schools and all the 1,867 intermediate schools are for both sexes. Of the secondary schools 16 are for boys, 21 for girls, and 79 are mixed.

Greece. All primary education is in mixed schools. Of the gymnasia 45 are for boys, 38 for girls, and 100 are mixed.

Rumania. State primary education is almost entirely in mixed schools; of private primary schools

71 are for boys, 79 for girls, and 1,264 are mixed. Of the State gymnasia 17 are for boys, 25 for girls, while 56 are mixed.

Czechoslovakia. During the existence of the Republic, primary education was almost entirely in mixed schools—580 schools were for boys, 616 for girls, and 14,570 were mixed. Of intermediate schools 520 were for boys, 528 for girls, and 917 were mixed. Of secondary schools 13 were for boys, 78 for girls, while 296 were mixed. There existed also many experimental schools where American influence was felt. In all, during the country's independence, kindergartens were 100 per cent., primary and intermediate schools 88 per cent. and secondary schools 74 per cent. mixed.

Jugoslavia. Primary education is almost entirely coeducational—there are 109 schools for boys, 119 for girls, and 8,364 are mixed. Of intermediate schools 14 are for boys, 43 for girls, and 156 are mixed. Of secondary schools 39 are for boys, 23 for girls, and 117 are mixed.

Egypt. There are 945 primary schools for boys, 641 for girls, and 6,590 are mixed.

The Baltic States: Esthonia. Of the secondary schools 14 are for boys, 10 for girls, and 42 are mixed. All training colleges are for both sexes, and the tendency is for coeducation to spread.

Latvia. Primary schools are almost all mixed. Of gymnasia 4 are for boys, 5 for girls, and 67 are mixed.

Lithuania. There are 9 secondary schools for boys, 8 for girls, and 50 are mixed.

Poland. Of the public elementary schools 95 per cent. are mixed, and of the private ones 63 per cent. The balance in secondary education tends towards segregation—231 schools are for boys, 230 for girls, and 250 are for both sexes—but the general tendency is towards coeducation. Some ten years ago there were as many as 28 coeducational boarding schools in the country.

Russia. It may be worth while dwelling for a moment on the history of education in Russia, for the benefit of those simple people who suppose that everything was black before the Revolution and everything white (though that is perhaps hardly the correct adjective) since. Peter the Great (1700-25) took decisive steps towards the emancipation of woman, making her an equal member of society with man, and Russia was the first country in the world to establish State secondary schools for girls (1764). These were formed under the " general Statute for the education of the youth of both sexes " of Catherine the Great (1762-96), which provided for school attendance between the ages of five to eighteen at State boarding schools. The scheme, however, proved abortive, and a thin trickle of " blind alley " girls' schools was the result. In 1764 Catherine adopted the Austrian school system, which by 1804 was educating 18,000 boys and 2,000 girls in nearly 500 schools. But her original bold attempt at a democratic educational scheme, open to all social classes and both sexes, free and secular, should not be forgotten by those who are finding the same thing

difficult to achieve, more than a hundred and fifty years later.[1] The Statutes of 1804 were based on Condorcet's essays *Sur l'Instruction Publique* (1792), and affected the course of Russian educational policy for many years. These were promulgated by Alexander I (1801-25), and among other things they abolished corporal punishment—while over in England Dr. Keate was flogging Etonians into virtue up to the number of eighty in a single day. Under Alexander's scheme all schools were open to all social classes gratuitously; at first girls were accepted right through—for instance in the gymnasia and the district schools up till 1829—but their attendance was forbidden under the social and political reaction which set in with Nicholas I (1825-55). During the period of liberal reforms of 1856-66 numerous girls' schools were founded, and the elementary schools, which accepted children of all social classes, were allowed to be coeducational. In 1905 coeducational commercial schools began to be established, and these educated large numbers of boys and girls. Rural schools became increasingly coeducational; if the Minister of Education would not permit their establishment in urban districts, the Minister of Transport (who was jointly responsible with him for secondary education) could generally be relied upon to make the necessary grant. Russia was the first country in the world to establish university

[1] For a full account of Russian educational development, see N. Hans: *History of Russian Educational Policy* 1701-1917 (P. S. King), 1931.

education for women, subsidized by the Government; this was in 1869—the same year in which Girton College was founded in England, privately and with no State encouragement. Before the Great War there were 25,000 women students at the universities, and in 1915 all State universities opened their doors to women on equal terms with men, whether as students or as teachers. The Bolshevik Revolution which granted women the vote was thus only completing a long process of steady emancipation. *Vixere fortes ante* Lunacharsky.

After the Revolution universal compulsory coeducation was introduced at a blow, by the simple process of ordering all girls' schools to accept by preference boys, and vice versa. The early results were, as might be supposed, unfortunate, but educational progress in recent years has settled down on to a fairly even keel, and Russian education is now developing along healthy lines—even if it is, by English progressive standards, a trifle old-fashioned. (The best English authority on Soviet schools, Beatrice King, writes: "There are more interesting experimental schools in England than any I have seen in the U.S.S.R."[1]) The proportion of women teachers at present is 70 per cent. in primary and 51 per cent. in secondary schools.

The South American Republics: Bolivia. There are 13 secondary schools for boys, 11 for girls, and 8 are mixed.

[1] B. King: *Changing Man: the educational system of the U.S.S.R.* (Gollancz), 1936.

Brazil. Of the State primary schools, 1,461 are for boys, 881 for girls, and 21,358 are mixed. Of the State secondary schools, 7 are for boys, 5 for girls, and 60 are mixed. Of private primary schools, 463 are for boys, 428 for girls, and 5,796 are mixed; and of private secondary schools, 102 are for boys, 64 for girls, and 209 are mixed.

Chile. Of the primary schools, 727 are for boys, 759 for girls, and 2,131 are mixed. Of secondary and private schools, 77 are for boys, 103 for girls, and 57 are mixed.

Uruguay. There are 47 boys' primary schools, 27 girls', and 1,365 mixed. There are no secondary schools for boys, one for girls, and 27 are mixed.

Thus, in all the South American countries for which figures are available, taken together, the primary schools are close on 90 per cent., and the secondary schools about 50 per cent. coeducational.

Scandinavia: Finland. The pioneer coeducational secondary school was the Nya Svenska Läroverket, founded in 1880. By 1910 there were 72 mixed schools, staffed by an equal number of men and women, and shortly before the Great War 23 per cent. of matriculants at universities were women. At present all elementary schools are mixed, and of the State secondary schools 27 are for boys, 25 for girls, and 35 are mixed. The coeducational tradition in private secondary schools is very strong: only 2 are for boys, 21 are for girls, and 120 are mixed. Thus the country's primary schools are 100 per cent. and its secondary schools 66 per cent. coeducational.

Sweden. The first coeducational private school was the famous pioneer Palmgrenska Samskolan, opened at Stockholm in 1876. Coeducation was adopted in most State schools in the early years of the present century. Swedish education has long been distinguished by its large proportion of private girls' schools; in 1922 there were 84 of them. A Commission which sat in 1919 to consider coeducation, reported in favour of mixed schools, and in 1927 most of its findings were adopted by Parliament. At present all State primary schools without exception, and almost all post-primary " middle " schools, are mixed. (There are 10 middle schools for boys and 12 for girls, while 105 are for both sexes.) Of the State secondary schools 15 are for boys, 32 for girls, and 165 are mixed. Of private infant and primary schools 5 are for boys, 11 for girls, and 26 are mixed; and of private secondary schools 7 are for boys, 48 for girls, and 13 are mixed. Thus in the State educational scheme the primary schools are 100 per cent. and the secondary schools 80 per cent. coeducational; while a rather higher degree of segregation persists in the small number of private schools. Sweden is making a serious effort to educate its democracy: after the universal compulsory elementary education from seven till fourteen, the alternatives are secondary education lasting a minimum of four years, or compulsory continuation schools for two or three years for those who do not proceed to a regular secondary school.

Denmark. Coeducation was practised as early as

the eighteenth century in the rural districts, which held 62 per cent. of the population. Later the towns, led by Copenhagen, followed suit. The example of some pioneer private schools was followed in the early years of the present century, and State schools had become almost entirely coeducational by 1903. At present, the country's 3,965 primary schools and 227 secondary schools, both in town and country, are fully coeducational, the only exceptions being some segregated "special" schools for difficult children.

Norway. This country appears to have a higher degree of coeducation than any other in Europe. Coeducation was adopted by law in all State schools as long ago as 1896. At present all State primary and intermediate schools are mixed; there are no State secondary boys' schools, 3 for girls, and 103 mixed. Of private intermediate and secondary schools one is for boys, 2 for girls, and 8 are mixed. Thus the primary schools of the country are 100 per cent., and the secondary schools about 95 per cent. co-educational.

U.S.A. We have already seen that the coeducational tradition in America is an old one, from motives partly of democracy and partly of economy. Many years ago a Government report found it to be "natural (following the ordinary structure of the family and of society), customary (in harmony with the habits and sentiments of everyday life), impartial (affording the sexes the same opportunities of culture), economical (using school funds to the best

advantage), convenient (in teaching and discipline), and beneficial (to the minds, morals, habits and development of the pupils)." By 1850 there were 11 coeducational " public high schools," by 1870 there were 160, and by 1911 99 per cent. of them were mixed. But there was some adverse criticism, and some considerable opposition. In 1873 a Boston doctor wrote a book to show that coeducation was injurious to the proper physical development of girls, and he later found some support in the writings of the egregious Stanley Hall. Heated public discussion of the issue followed, but eventually Boston, the centre of the opposition, decided to reverse its segregational policy for schools. At the outbreak of the Great War a striking feature of American education was the high proportion of women teachers: in 1914 no less than 70 per cent. of all the staff of public schools were women—men suffered no disabilities as teachers, but simply preferred other professions. Since then the balance has become less uneven. The coeducational trend has been subject to certain fluctuations from time to time. Since 1914 there has been a slight increase of segregated schools for specialized vocational training. The decline of coeducation in certain Eastern States is largely a matter of class exclusiveness. In New York, the old coeducational public school for all children alike, without distinction, has been affected by the reluctance of the richer parents to send their children to the same school as the lowest-class immigrant from some backward European country; it has further

been influenced, not always for good, by the English public school model, which finds woman a matter for embarrassment. Among the universities, Ohio opened its doors to women as early as 1833, and this policy was adopted almost universally throughout Western America from 1862 onwards. Since some people have been inclined to correlate American education and divorce statistics, it may be pertinent to notice that divorce there is both cheap and easy, whereas in our own country it is expensive and difficult. Education is, certainly, one of the factors affecting a country's divorce rate; but it is very far from being the only one.

At present all State elementary schools are co-educational, as are 10,000 private elementary schools (four-fifths of them being Catholic parochial day schools). Of public high schools 74 are for boys only, 59 for girls only, and 24,584 are mixed. Of private high schools 484 are for boys only, 783 for girls only, and 1,333 are mixed. Of institutions for higher education 223 are for men only, 280 for women only, and 1,206 are for both sexes. (The secondary boarding schools, which number about 1,000, are usually not coeducational.) In all, of the 25 million children at school in all elementary schools —private, Catholic and tax-supported alike—95 per cent are being coeducated; while more than 90 per cent of all places of secondary education are also coeducational.

The British Commonwealth: Australia. Figures are not easily obtainable, since there are six quite

separate educational authorities, and their practice varies greatly. The schools of New South Wales, for instance, are mostly mixed, but where the total attendance amounts to more than 350, two separate departments are formed for boys and girls respectively; there are 66 secondary schools calling themselves mixed, but mostly having segregated classrooms. Of the private secondary schools in Tasmania 15 are for boys, 13 for girls, and 40 are mixed. Southern Australia has 177 private schools, all of them mixed. Most of the schools in Queensland also are coeducational.

New Zealand. Practically all the 2,378 State primary schools are mixed, any departure from this practice being a matter of convenience, not of principle. Of State secondary schools 14 are for boys, 15 for girls, and 122 are mixed. All the 21 technical schools are mixed. Of private primary and intermediate schools 43 are for boys, 39 for girls, while 224 are mixed; all the 57 private schools except one, on the other hand, are segregational.

Canada. Outside the cities, boys and girls are comparatively seldom separated at most schools, either in classes or playgrounds; but in Catholic schools separation begins at the age of twelve or thirteen, except in rural schools where the numbers are insufficient to form two departments. In the seventy largest cities of Canada there are 1,578 public-controlled schools; in 745 of these boys and girls are together for teaching, and almost always for play also. The highest degree of segregation is in

districts where there are most denominational schools. Of the 323 private schools, elementary and secondary, 190 are mixed.

South Africa. The school system is preponderantly coeducational; of the primary schools 22 are for boys only, 20 for girls only, while 4,321 are mixed; of the intermediate and secondary schools 35 are for boys, 45 for girls, and 211 are mixed. Thus 99 per cent. of the elementary schools of the Dominion, and 75 per cent. of the secondary schools, are coeducational.

The following are the figures for the British Isles:

Ireland. The primary schools are mostly mixed, and the secondary mostly segregated. Of the primary schools 877 are for boys, 885 for girls, and 3,371 are mixed. Of the secondary schools 147 are for boys, 151 for girls, and 29 are mixed.

Scotland. The tradition of mixed schools is, as we have seen, of long standing, and reaches back to the Protestant influence of Luther and his followers. Practically all the primary schools are mixed, the exceptions being Catholic or Episcopalian Church schools, whose numbers are tending steadily to diminish. Post-primary education in Scotland has been a slow growth out of primary, and was given at first in the same schools; thus mixed classes were retained until gradually what amounted to co-education was given. At present, 13 of the secondary schools are for boys, 11 for girls, and 227 are mixed. Thus well over 90 per cent. of children in Scotland

are in mixed schools. Those who are worried about divorce statistics may like to know that the Scottish divorce rate is lower than in England.

England and Wales. Of the ten million children being educated at primary schools, including infant schools, $2\frac{1}{2}$ million are at segregated boys' schools, $2\frac{1}{2}$ million at segregated girls' schools, and 5 million are at mixed schools. There are 2,002 State primary schools for boys, 3,258 for girls, while 23,064 are for both sexes together. Of secondary schools 513 are for boys, 496 for girls, and 389 are mixed. The details of these are as follows:[1]

Council schools	218 for boys,	285 for girls,	270 mixed
Roman Catholic schools ..	29 ,, ,,	63 ,, ,,	0 ,,
Foundation and other schools	243 ,, ,,	123 ,, ,,	64 ,,
Welsh Intermediate schools	23 ,, ,,	25 ,, ,,	55 ,,

The Welsh Intermediate Education Act of 1889 gave a strong fillip to the establishment of mixed secondary day schools in that country; many English teachers who were later to influence the coeducational trend of English education, gained their experience in these.

No statistics are available for private schools; the Board of Education, as we have seen, does not know very much about them. Certain schools it has visited and "recognized," and these number 511 schools for boys, 495 for girls, and 387 for both sexes together.[2]

[1] *Education in 1938* (H.M. Stationery Office), 1939.
[2] *List of Secondary Schools and Preparatory Schools recognized as efficient* (H.M. Stationery Office), 1936-7; list 60.

In the primary and infant schools of England and Wales there are 29,224 departments, of which 12,623 have men and 16,591 women as head teachers.

It should be borne in mind that the figures given in this chapter cannot hope to give an adequate notion of the extent to which genuine coeducation is practised in the countries concerned. Sometimes the term "mixed" or "coeducational" certainly means a full sharing of school life, both in and out of school; sometimes, equally certainly, it signifies little more than the teaching of the two sexes under the same roof. But it can at least be said of all the thousands of schools listed above, which are not definitely classed as segregated, that they have the opportunity of bringing up girls and boys together.

CHAPTER X

OBJECTIONS AND ADVANTAGES CONSIDERED

"IF," said J. F. Roxburgh of Stowe on one occasion, "the system of coeducational boarding schools were all that it is claimed to be, it would have carried the country long ago." This remark shows little understanding of the English, or indeed of any other, character; but it is worth quoting because it does represent the obscure feeling of orthodox people, the great majority of whom have never been inside a coeducational school, that there must be some overwhelming objection (although one might not be able to put one's finger on it if suddenly challenged in argument . . .) to a system of education which, after all, continues not to attract the Best People. It is therefore worth while to set forth all the objections which one advocate of coeducation, who has kept his ears wide open on the subject for some years, has heard spoken, and all those which have found their way into print—or as many as the fairly discursive reading of one individual has come across. If coeducation were the norm, it is well to consider what would induce intelligent people to advocate segregation—what does, in fact, induce many of them to fight shy of the coeducational experiment.

First place should be given to the most often expressed criticism, that coeducation makes girls masculine and boys effeminate. It is supported by pointing to some freak known personally to the critic (or more often to someone known to a friend of the critic), who happens to have been coeducated. But this, as an argument, really will not do; it is as if one should condemn Winchester and Eton as breeding-grounds for revolutionary Socialists because of Stafford Cripps and John Strachey. The only fair way to consider the question is to compare the masculinity and femininity, respectively, of boys and girls of the same type who have been educated in these two different ways, and to observe the actual life of a coeducated school, and thus see in what ways it tends to harden girls or soften boys unduly. Those who have had experience of both sorts of school will probably agree that it is the orthodox segregated schools which tend to foster the half-men and half-women, for the very cogent reason that in a boys' public school a woman substitute is found psychologically necessary by the males, and in a girls' public school a man substitute is craved by the females. When a performer in a music hall of the cruder sort wishes to mimic the boys' public school product, he does so with a certain sort of lisp and wriggling gait; and his point goes home to the audience instantly. It may be an unfair point; but it is caught up and understood. In a coeducational school, on the other hand, there is every psychological reason possible to urge the boys to become

truly male, and the girls truly female—namely, the presence of the opposite sex. It is, of course, true that in its early pioneering days the coeducational school had an undue proportion of children who were in one way or another odd. But our critic must, in fairness, argue not about the human material that such schools once contained, but about the tendencies of coeducation as a method of upbringing. Since, in a segregated school, adolescents do want someone of the opposite sex as a love object, there is a strong tendency for homosexual types to emerge—one only needs to go to the university to see them there, in their dozens; but since few boys like hoydenish girls, and few girls appreciate effeminate boys, there is in a coeducational school exactly the opposite tendency. Just because of the presence of girls, boys are likely to be proud of their masculinity; and just because of the presence of boys, girls are likely to be happy in their womanliness. If by masculinity is meant physical bullying and lack of consideration for others, then our critic shall have his point conceded at once; and if by womanliness is meant meek behaviour, coyness and lack of enterprise, no further argument is necessary—it is the general experience of coeducational teachers who come straight from segregated schools that boys have better things to do than make other boys cry, and that girls are not entirely demure. Those who feel that boys ought to be cruel, and girls colourless, would be well advised to steer clear of a coeducational school. Those who believe—as all supporters of

coeducation do—that a boy is the better man for learning not to take advantage of physical weakness, and that a girl is the better woman for having once been something of a tomboy, should find in coeducation the kind of upbringing that will satisfy them.

Another criticism is based on the admittedly different intellectual approach of the sexes. It is true, as we have seen, that there are intellectual, overlapping with the psychological, differences between girls and boys; but that is no reason against their common teaching. There is no wider difference of mental attitudes between boys and girls than between boys and boys, or girls and girls; in so far as it is based on sex it is usefully complementary. The only evidence worth having here is that of co-educational teachers: segregational teachers cannot possibly know. And it would be difficult to find a teacher who had come from a segregated to a co-educational school, who did not find the variety of the sexual intellectual difference wholly stimulating and refreshing. It is often said that coeducation makes teaching methods more difficult; so it does, but only the lazy teacher could consider that an argument for segregation. It is said that the two sexes ought not to have identical curricula; the answer is that they do not. It is said, finally, that overmuch brainwork is undesirable for growing girls, and that academic competition between the sexes may cause girls to become "anaemic and shattered in health." With this a coeducational teacher will cordially agree; but he will point out

that the traditional home of academic competition is the segregated schools, whereas the pioneer coeducational schools, at least, have dispensed with marks, prizes, form places and that whole foolish paraphernalia altogether. The argument from anaemia is calculated to demolish, not coeducation but the view (based on how little actual evidence!) that children will not learn unless they can do somebody else down in the process.

On the question of the management of coeducational schools, critics point out that they must be difficult to organize. Of course they are; supporters of the system only wish that these critics would remember the admission when they show themselves eager to point out minor flaws in their organization. This argument from laziness can scarcely be expected to cause women and men who have a real faith in a certain relationship between the sexes, and in a certain way of life, to quail before some hard work. Maud Royden used to protest that it was bad that a man should always be head of a mixed school. Agreed; it is equally bad that a woman always should be. The ideal is clearly a married couple, running a coeducational school jointly; and this situation is in fact occasionally found. Meanwhile, it must be remembered that in the existing system of society—and indeed in any system of society, as far as the biological difference of sexual function is concerned—man has more time and freedom from family affairs, and is better able to attend uninterruptedly to management. That is not to say that he

necessarily manages better. The question of unequal pay for men and women teachers is a criticism, not so much of coeducation as of the social system: at present the man has to provide for possible marriage. The answer to this criticism lies in the State endowment of motherhood, the value of which is likely to be best appreciated by coeducated women and men. It is sometimes said that in any case women are not so good at giving orders as men; or alternatively, that men do not willingly obey women. If the first is true, it is a reply to the point that women do not get their fair share of management in coeducation; if the second is the case, it is because they have not been brought up to do so—and the spread of coeducation will hasten the day when that particularly stupid form of sex rivalry will cease. In so far as women are bad " bosses," it is because they know nothing of men; and in so far as men are " difficult " subordinates, it is because they know nothing of women. Men and women who have learnt, as children, to serve under the other sex, will best be able to work together without friction as adults. It is unfortunately the case that many men teachers are prejudiced against coeducation because they have, and wish to hold, the best professional positions —including the higher posts in the Board of Education, and most inspectorships, directorships of education and headships of mixed post-primary schools; it is equally the case, unfortunately, that many women do not want to surrender their claim to the one professional corner where they have got a

foothold. But all this is no argument against coeducation itself: if it is anything, it is an argument against the sex antagonism to which lack of coeducation gives rise. The point is, whether coeducation is good, or the reverse, for the children. In any case, it is not true that English education is man-run to such an extent as is often supposed. Infant schools invariably have women as heads, and the distribution of other headships is set forth at the end of the preceding chapter; even the number of women heads of senior mixed schools is increasing.

A further series of criticisms is founded on the fact that girls and boys have different parts to play in the world, and that they will therefore want different things at school. Of course they will; the question is, whether they should obtain those things in the presence of the other sex. Such criticisms are based on the supposition that coeducation means identical education, whereas it means shared education. Once a critic starts by defining a coeducational school as a place where "boys and girls are taught the same things at the same time, in the same place, by the same faculty, with the same methods, and under the same regimen," [1] he must be a poor hand if he cannot make the system look foolish. Even an eminent psychologist, as we have seen, can discuss coeducation without knowing what it means as actually practised. It is a common criticism that the interests of girls are sacrificed to those of boys,

[1] E. H. Clarke: *Sex in Education* (Boston), 1874. In this book the word "coeducation" is used apparently for the first time.

that girls are being made to fit into a system which was designed for the other sex. This criticism is valid as applied to many mixed State schools, but has little relevance to the pioneer schools which have, from the start, catered for both sexes. It presupposes that a good coeducational school is a boys' school with a number of girls in it; and that is a false, even a mischievous, conception. A coeducational school is not a queer sort of boys' or girls' school: it is something quite different from either—how different, only someone who has worked in both coeducational and segregated schools can know. In fact, there is far more chance of the different needs of the sexes being recognized, and suitably allowed for, when they are being brought up together, since it is quite impossible not to be aware of them. The Report on the Differentiation of Curricula was quite right to refer to the danger of over-pressing girls and failing to push boys to the full extent of their capacities; the distinguished educationist Joseph Wicksteed, for many years head of King Alfred, said that "far more than is recognized, the higher education of women, notwithstanding its inestimable social and psychological value, has been responsible for physical and nervous damage scarcely less cruel than the premature sex life, or the relentlessly frequent motherhood, of savage and barbarous peoples."[1] There is a need, in a coeducational school, for an elastic curriculum to allow for individual speeds,

[1] J. Wicksteed: *The Challenge of Childhood, an essay on nature and education* (Chapman & Hall), 1936.

as well as methods, of work. But it is just the coeducational schools which are experimenting most freely along these lines: their time-tables are probably the least rigid of any in the country. The Consultative Committee thought that girls tended to be overshadowed by boys, to find them occasionally a " depressing element "; and there is some truth in this. But if girls are slow to arrive at an independent outlook and to show power of initiative, if they are reluctant to accept responsibility—and many observers are agreed that there is this tendency in them—the solution is not less, but more shared experience with boys. In a coeducational school both boys and girls can learn to appreciate each other's obvious superiority—and obvious weakness—in different spheres. In so far as girls tend to resign leadership to boys, this is due to bad tradition, and a convention sedulously fostered by segregational training. If it is said that they will always lack the self-confidence to compete with boys, it must be replied—the point has been made already, but it can hardly be insisted on too often—that sex rivalry at school should receive absolutely no encouragement, and that all opportunities for it should be carefully avoided.

It is said that discipline is made impossible by the coexistence of two sexes who must obviously be treated in different ways; it is claimed that authority in boys' schools is traditionally based on physical force, and that " moral suasion " is no use to them at certain stages in their development; while girls, who

are not so self-assertive, and have less urgent—or more controlled—animal spirits, are so sensitive to disapproval that they cannot possibly be subjected to the same sanctions as the tougher sex. By way of clinching this argument, it is pointed out how unsuitable corporal punishment is for girls. Certainly it is; and it is unsuitable for boys, for exactly the same reasons. The fact that public school education is based, in the last resort, upon physical violence, cannot reasonably be used as an argument against a system which eschews such violence. If coeducational schools had taken over the misguided views of traditional schools concerning punishment, and sought to apply them to both sexes alike, it would indeed be a serious charge against them; but they have not done so, possibly because the presence of women renders men and boys less brutal (it may fairly be claimed that one finds less anger, and fewer tears, in a coeducational school than in places where one sex is deprived of the other's company), or possibly because the coeducational movement attracts women and men who are less ignorant of the findings of psychology on the question of punishment. It is said, again, that boys need men to educate them. So they do; and they have men to educate them in a coeducational school. Probably rather more than half the staff will be women, but many of these are in charge of the health and domestic side, and there will clearly be a preponderance of women in the infants' and junior departments; so that boys over fourteen will be

taught mainly by men. Critics always feel more certain that boys need men, than that girls need women, to influence them during their last few school years. The truth is that both sexes need adults of both sexes, and at a coeducational school they find them; at a segregated school the absence of adults is a deprivation only a little less serious than the absence of coevals of the opposite sex.

Again, critics of coeducation feel that there can be too much forcing of young people to be together: they do not want, nor ought they to want, to share every activity. There is a large measure of truth in this belief, and those who practise coeducation habitually arrange for times and places of privacy for both sexes. It is usually girls who feel the need for getting away from the noise and cheerful gatherings that form the core of boarding school life; and it would be a poor school that did not give them opportunity to do so. It may be that there is an instinctive desire among both sexes to draw slightly apart at puberty; or it may be simply a matter of tradition that would be better abandoned. Meanwhile, it is the part of wisdom to allow for the possibility of withdrawal, without comment. What is certain is that girls and boys do not want to be completely separated at any age: sometimes they want each other's company, and sometimes they prefer their own. Coeducation gives them the right and the opportunity to choose; segregation denies them both these things.

It used to be supposed that coeducated men and

women found some difficulty in obtaining jobs, because of the prejudice that existed against that form of upbringing. If ever this was true, it is now no longer so. In 1933 Arnold Lloyd sent a questionnaire to twenty coeducational schools (some of them, perhaps, more fitly described as coinstructional; but their title was the important thing), nine of them boarding and the rest day schools; and a further ten copies to administrators, professors and heads of colleges. The result[1] was a fairly representative selection of opinions, and revealed no foundation whatever for the fears indicated above: coeducation, it was unanimously agreed, was no handicap to a boy (purely from the point of view of obtaining employment) and an actual help to a girl. This last fact is not surprising; a coeducated girl would be extremely unlikely to find casual office flirtations amusing.

Children at coeducational schools always find it difficult to appreciate the self-consciousness of their less fortunate contemporaries in the presence of the opposite sex. Almost, they find it impossible to believe in the existence of a segregated school, in the sense of realizing its atmosphere, and they ask amusing and amused questions about the kind of life that goes on inside it. It sounds to them very dull and very unnatural. Sometimes girls who have been brought up in home surroundings that approximate to good coeducation, notice how their old playmates—now at public schools—behave to them

[1] Reported in *The Years Between*—see bibliography.

during the holidays, how awkward and distant, or else flirtatious and importunate, they have become; and they wonder how, in the face of such obvious evidence of deterioration, anyone can continue to believe in segregated schools. It may fairly be claimed that, if coeducation does not completely remove the prime defects of public school upbringing —intellectual apathy, coercion, restriction of opportunity, conformity to type, lack of emotional development, and all the rest of them—it at least reduces them to a minimum. Wherever there is lack of feminine society at school, the standard of life tends to become brutalized; and it is not only the realm of sex in a traditional segregated school—where the attitude to woman is a mixture of ignorance, dirty-mindedness and, most dangerous of all, vague idealism—that suffers from being deprived of one half of human life.

The practical advantages, in the broadening of educational opportunity where boys and girls are together, need hardly be stressed; even the sternest critics are usually willing to concede these. In music and the other arts, in singing, dancing and acting, in woman's capacity for making rooms pleasant and civilized places to live in, the superiority of the coeducational school is not likely to be challenged. The curriculum is necessarily wider than at a segregated school, so that boys have a chance of learning to weave and cook, and girls to carpenter, to name the first instances of additional opportunity that spring to mind. The value of a mixed staff is

generously admitted even by Barbara Low. There can be few people who feel that the atmosphere of a bachelor or a spinster common room is one of the fairest flowers of segregated education. To take a single example, conversation in a man's segregated common-room seldom wanders far from a certain narrow field of "shop," comprising the "moral question," athletics, the keeping of discipline in class, bullying, cribbing and form orders. (Some Mass-Observation is needed in this interesting field, but this list is probably roughly representative.) It must be seldom indeed that any of these unsavoury topics are mentioned in a mixed common-room, because life at a coeducational school is normally organized so that quite other values are regarded as important.

Coeducation does not deny the family as a means of educational development, but rather takes over home life as its model, enlarging its scope and deepening its influence. It has been held, with some reason, that a large family is the best kind of school; this, roughly, is what a coeducational school is. Nature, left to her own devices, provides parents with a mixture of girls and boys, and the unrestricted household of the last century was something like a mixed "home school." Certainly a large family is not so large as a school is normally forced by economic circumstances to be; but mixed schools base their "home life" on small social groups, and come nearer than any other type of school to realizing the necessity for small classes and small boarding houses. If these latter are organized on an

age basis, the proper attention can be given to each child. But if in the past many children were, in a sense, coeducated in large families during a few weeks of the year at any rate, they are now no longer: the large family has as good as disappeared from our society. Arnold Lloyd quotes[1] a family analysis recently drawn up in a coeducational school of 170 children: of 85 boys 9 were " only " children, and 33 had no sisters; and of 85 girls 9 were " onlies " and 24 had no brothers. Thus among 70 children, whom there is no reason to suppose not typical of their age, 18 were " only " children, and one in three had at home no companion of the opposite sex. This is an answer to those critics who say that segregated children can easily find the company of the other sex at home: many of them simply cannot. With the steady diminution in the size of the family, the value of coeducation grows proportionately greater. Boys who come to coeducation from a " normal "—that is, an abnormal—school are quick to appreciate the home atmosphere, the cheerfulness and colour that feminine influence imparts, and the widening of human interest in the presence of young children, even infants with whom it is possible to play. Personal relationships are infinitely richer in coeducation than in any other type of school.

Mention has been made of the different standards of values that obtain in a coeducational school; these are mostly, but not entirely, due to the presence of the two sexes together. In addition there is the fact

[1] In *The Years Between*—see bibliography.

that coeducational schools tend to be civilized in other ways too. It is the unanimous impression of visitors that such schools are cheerful places; there is more laughter, more good-will, more helpfulness when the sexes are together—it would be very strange indeed if there were not. Perhaps the commonest remark heard from visitors is that " the children look friendly." They notice too the absence of constraint in outward personal relationships; they get the impression that each sex is most itself in the presence of the other. Here again, it would be strange if it were not so, since the terms male and female are meaningless except in relation to each other. They notice the absence of that petty preoccupation with etiquette, sartorial and social, which is one of the absurdest features of so many segregated schools; this is probably a manifestation of the creative instinct which in such places is thwarted, but in coeducation has free play in everyday life, especially in self-government and the management of the " home " side. They observe the toleration that co-education tends to produce; those who know both types of school agree that there is no comparison between them here—Nature, expelled with the fork of distrust, returns to avenge the slight, and a segregated common-room is probably the narrowest-minded place on earth.

The ethical ideal in a segregated school is necessarily lopsided, and the predominance of the purely physical has done great harm in these places. To a great extent the facts of physical growth determine a

boy's sense of values; he admires, very properly, bodily skill and courage, and self-assertiveness and the will to dominate consume a large proportion of his energies. In a segregated school this side of male nature is allowed to obfuscate his awakening moral consciousness and dawning appreciation of beauty, and his whole emotional life is relegated to a lower plane—simply because there is no scope for these things in his unnatural existence. The result is the emotional crudity, the moral infantilism, for which the products of such schools are widely known. Life is man and woman, and their relations are the most important human thing in a society; school is a training ground for society, and if the sexes are brought up separately every social value is hopelessly falsified from the start. The different ethics of a coeducational school are immediately noticeable; manliness is not bound up with a limited and conventional code, nor womanliness with servility (or with its hideous modern substitute, female " push "). Physical force ceases to be the chief criterion of moral authority, and personal worth comes into its own.

The most important thing about a school is, of course, the influence which the children exert on each other; it is this, and not time-tables and theories and academic qualifications and educational equipment, which in the end matters most. Some of the mutual influences of the sexes have been mentioned already. In the earlier years boys derive a valuable intellectual stimulus from the presence of girls in the same class, and boy nature is so constituted that there is little

danger of their being hurried beyond their normal rate of progress. The girl is usually a more willing worker than the boy; she must often be restrained from doing too much, while he must often be urged to do more. She likes to be instructed, and is quite willing to sit down and have learning pumped into her. He is impatient of learning, and his interest is apt to wane as soon as he thinks he has grasped an idea; but he is eager enough to search for new ideas. The presence of either sex helps to remedy the faults of the other. Homer Lane found that curiosity, and mental alertness in general, were greater when the sexes were together. A boy learns greater self-restraint in the presence of girls, better manners and language, more modesty and gentleness, deeper appreciation of beautiful things, greater kindness to other boys; in a word, he becomes more manly. A girl loses pettiness and sentimentality, gains in self-respect, self-reliance and freedom of expression, and can pass through the tomboy stage without constant rebuke; she carries responsibility with less excessive sensitiveness, is less feverish in work, less resentful of correction, less spiteful to other girls; briefly, she becomes more womanly. Brothers and sisters need not be separated at a coeducational school. For both boys and girls sex tension is lessened, and they gain a proper appreciation of the place of personality in the sexual relationship; this gives an added dignity to both sexes. They learn co-operation and mutual aid; the boy's making a rabbit hutch for a girl, or the girl's knitting a scarf

for a boy, are trivial instances of something that is both far-reaching and important. Girls are not expected to clear up after boys, as women so often are after men in adult life; the sharing of household jobs, and the realization by both sexes of the other's method of approach to these, is not the least valuable part of their "home" education. Boys help girls to fuss less over trifles, and girls help boys to use their feelings; boys help girls to question authority, and girls help boys to be conscientious. The list of mutual benefits might be indefinitely prolonged; they may fitly be summed up in the claim that girls and boys are good for each other, and that a life shared by them is happier and humaner than lives lived apart.

CHAPTER XI

COEDUCATION AND SEX

THERE is one aspect of coeducation which has, so far, only been dealt with by implication, and must now be more fully considered. It is one which ill-informed critics of the system are always eager to broach, and they call it, a trifle dramatically, "love affairs." There can be few supporters of coeducation who have not, at one time or another, been challenged on this subject; the technique is painfully familiar—the critic talks airily about mixed hockey and girls' weak mathematics, as if sex were the last thing he is thinking about, and then, slightly lowering his voice, he suddenly says: "Tell me—how far do they go?" It is a very great pity that the subject of sex must be separated from others, in discussing coeducation, but it must apparently be so, while critics insist on supposing that the atmosphere of mixed schools is sex-saturated, and that sex is a compartment of human nature quite distinct from all the others. Neither thing is true: the air at a coeducational school is certainly less highly charged with sex than it is at a segregated school, because there is a freer expression of it in natural ways. And sex is not a separate compartment of our natures—our

failure to live successful sexual lives is precisely the measure of our separating it from the rest of us. Above all things, it must not be so separated in education.

Criticism on this subject takes two forms, which are mutually contradictory: it is said that coeducation causes sex-stimulation, and that it causes an unnatural indifference. In other words, some people object to the system because boys and girls will fall in love, others because they won't. Coeducation is blamed at the same time for encouraging precocious flirtation, and for destroying the bloom of romance. The truth is that some girls and boys do "fall in love," while many more do not; and that "falling in love" does not mean what our critics suppose it to mean. It may be a very strong emotional attachment indeed, but it is not regarded—as such things normally are in the adult world—as a prelude to marriage. The best of such friendships are the best things that happen at a coeducational school at all; and the worst of them are certainly not its worst problems. This matter of "undesirable friendships" has been greatly over-exaggerated by critics of the system. They do, of course, exist; but they are never wholly undesirable—where there is love, there is something good, awkward though it may be. The most undesirable friendship conceivable at a coeducational school is not so serious or so lamentable an affair as its counterpart at a segregated school—because it does not involve the psychological warping that a homosexual passion necessarily connotes.

Homosexuality is non-existent at a genuine coeducational school. And the suggestion that the majority of children become "disillusioned" with the opposite sex is surely a little less than gallant. Do men really feel that women are only worth marrying because their faults have been decently veiled by a segregated education? And do women really believe that if a girl knew what a boy was like about the house, she could never bring herself to set up house permanently with him? It is true that coeducation completely crushes false romanticism—that is one of its most valuable contributions towards a right relationship between the sexes. Coeducated men and women are, however, not obviously more reluctant to marry than other people. Insufficient data on this subject have so far been collected, but J. H. Badley has shown[1] that his old pupils appear to marry (sometimes other old pupils) at least as much as anybody else. The chances of a coeducated woman or man, who has had intimate knowledge of the ways of the other sex, and of the snares of the affections, making a foolish marriage are surely small. Coeducation is no universal prophylactic against mismanagement of one's sexual life; but it is at least an attempt at a complete sexual education.

It is often asserted that the lure of sex at school must distract from serious study; that, after all, the friendships formed among seniors are based on sex attraction, which must tend to mature boys and girls

[1] In an appendix to *Bedales*—see bibliography.

precociously, and make it difficult for them to enter into everyday school life as befits their actual years. It is true that an emotional friendship disturbs work, as its counterpart at a segregated school does; human beings have not so far found, and very possibly never will find, a way of not being disturbed emotionally by each others' presence. But if one kind of serious study is to some extent disturbed by friendship, the friendship itself is another and possibly a much more serious study, likely to be of paramount educational value to its participants. There are more happy, realistic friendships, and far fewer painful " romantic " friendships in a coeducational than in a segregated school. And it remains true that the majority of firm " alliances," or regular companionships, are between girl and girl, or boy and boy respectively.

Critics will, no doubt, insist that coeducation arouses sex emotions which it does not intend should be satisfied. On the contrary, it is segregated education which provides no proper outlets for the emotions that will anyhow be aroused where human beings live together. A coeducational school provides full and wide sublimated satisfaction in the whole bisexual surroundings, in mutual services and the friendly intercourse of everyday life. Sex emotion, in its widest sense, does not need to be dammed up: it can express itself in the appreciation of beautiful surroundings (for it hardly needs saying that a school inhabited half by women will be infinitely less barrack-like than the segregated male school

commonly is), and in the frank affection between children which makes a mixed school such a pleasant place to live in. The education of the emotions is a profoundly important part of the education of the whole human being; a segregated school can simply not claim to be educating the whole being. Why should emotional experience be made—as it is made by orthodox schools—not only extremely difficult, but unnatural at that ? The introduction to sex will occur, anyhow, before maturity is reached; how should it not occur most healthily and auspiciously in more or less civilized surroundings, among circumstances planned to make it as happy as possible (growing up is, at best, not a very happy business), and watched over sympathetically by people who are not frightened of it ? A great deal of time, it may be said, is spent on adolescent friendships between boys and girls, which might have been otherwise employed. No doubt; some people will spend a large proportion of their time on affairs of the heart, in whatever circumstances they find themselves; and some will not. Girls who have had experience of both types of school say that the time spent on emotional attachments is about the same in each; and can it be doubted which is the better sort of attachment ? The way out of the waste land of homosexuality may be very arduous and the journey very painful. It would be a rash public schoolmaster who, knowing the extent to which homosexual attachments have boys in their grip (and some do know, though they seldom discuss it

with laymen—small blame to them), should assert that girls and boys at a coeducational school probably expend more energy on their emotional lives.

But our " How far do they go ? " critic still wants another word. " There is always," he says, " a slight possibility of a couple of pupils becoming parents." So there is; and there is always a slight possibility in segregated schools that a senior boy will seduce the housemaid, or a senior girl the boots. But there is much less likelihood of the first than of the second, because in a coeducational school a member of the opposite sex is necessarily known as a whole personality, not—as is all too likely at a segregated school—a sexual object. A reviewer, in the course of a not unsympathetic consideration of a book advocating coeducation as one part of a progressive upbringing,[1] wrote: " Over the difficult subject of sex [the author] skates with admirable deftness. . . . In one detail he is forced to be reticent . . . he is unable to speak except in general terms of the sex life of the pupil at a coeducational school. He will not be homosexual —he will not do this and he will not do that. What we should all like to know is what he *will* do." But it is not quite so simple as that; " what we should all like to know " is what this reviewer means by sex life. Surely it spreads throughout an adolescent's emotions, his day dreams, his night dreams, and his most secret imaginings—who is to describe such a

[1] L. B. Pekin: *Progressive Schools, their principles and practice* (Hogarth Press), 1932, reviewed in *Everyman* of May 4, 1934.

thing without giving a hopelessly false impression, even supposing that its nature could be remotely known ? There is no alembic of scientific statement in which it may be caught; it pervades and informs the whole being. If by " sex life " the reviewer means particular physical manifestations of passion, and wants, in fact, to know whether coeducational teachers approve of companionate marriages, the answer is that they do not. (Really, what answer did he expect ?) And if he still cannot understand why they do not spend sleepless nights wondering who is in bed with whom, the author of this plea for co-education will be pleased, at any time, to invite him right inside a thorough-going coeducational school, so that he may find out for himself why it is.

Advocates of segregation spend much time wondering whether coeducation is " safe "; coeducationists, for their part, originally founded the new type of school because segregation was so demonstrably " unsafe." Professor Findlay once complained that public school immorality was much exaggerated, and testified that a "substantial minority " of boys passed through unscathed; Jack Easy's wet-nurse herself could not have found a happier phrase. It is no solution of the sexual problem to segregate the sexes until maturity; segregation does not put off sexual awakening, it merely perverts it. Nor may Nature be sidetracked, by providing adolescents with so much hard physical exercise that they will have no time for sin. (One of the most striking things about sin is the remarkably short time that it

requires.) The mistake that segregated education makes is in regarding the "problem of sex" as a number of actions to be avoided. In the best-known book on school hygiene,[1] we find under the heading Dormitories the following sub-sections: Size, Superficial Area, Construction, Sanitary Conditions, Aspect, Light, Ventilation, Warming, Washing Arrangements, Beds and Bedding, and—Morality. Our attention is then turned to the dining-hall. . . . That is about the measure of the conventional view of sex at school: it is something wrong with the dormitories.

On the whole, one gets in a school the sexual attitude one expects; or, to put it in another way, the children's view of sex bears a very close relationship to the beliefs—and particularly the fears—of the adults. Many teachers atone for their own failure to be sexually healthy by bullying children into fear of sex; where schoolmasters expel children for sex offences—and there are still "respectable" schools which take this cruel and wicked course—they demonstrate, not their wish for a pure school tradition but their hatred of their own sexual nature. The memories of schoolmasters who punish children for masturbation must be very short indeed. Children masturbate mostly by way of compensation for something that is missing in their lives, usually opportunities for creativeness. (A. S. Neill once said[2] that

[1] Clement Dukes: *Health at School* (Rivingtons), 1905.
[2] In a lecture given to the first Summer School of the New Education Fellowship in 1921.

they do it for the joy of repenting—if they could approve of masturbation, they would have no desire to indulge in it; and there is a great deal of truth in this view of it as a masochistic action.) Even animals, kept in unnatural captivity, turn to masturbation for relief.[1] Masturbation is not, of course, always and only associated with sexual segregation; but segregation appears definitely to contribute towards it,[2] though there are many other factors too. It is not the physical effects of masturbation that are harmful, but its psychological consequences: physically, the action is of no significance—though there are still people who frighten children into supposing that it is dangerous, and therefore into continuing to masturbate; but the phantasies connected with it are of profound significance for psychological development. Similarly the physical satisfactions which boys at segregated schools indulge with each other are comparatively harmless; but each physical denial of the creative purpose of sex, with emotional accompaniment, leads them further into the dark tunnel of homosexuality from which there may be no emerging for a long while. Schoolmasters perpetuate sexual unhappiness among adolescents by associating sexual knowledge with guilt; one of the cruellest forms this association takes is the chapel sermon on the sin of masturbation—not, of course, mentioned from the pulpit by that name, but

[1] J. Wicksteed discusses this point well in his pamphlet *On the general principles and practice of King Alfred School* (1929).

[2] See the interesting evidence in Stephen Hobhouse and Fenner Brockway: *English Prisons Today* (Longmans, Green), 1922.

hinted at so clearly that everyone present, except possibly the masters' wives in their special stalls, knows what the headmaster means. Such sermons create guilt, and guilt encourages the physical indulgence. The wrong-headedness of this attitude was well illustrated by a comment which a schoolmaster reviewer made concerning the discussion of school sexuality referred to earlier in this chapter: [1] "The bloom of innocence," he wrote, "should not be wiped off even by the wisest and best intentioned of teachers." It must be that the writer is confusing innocence with ignorance—he can scarcely be supposed to be warning wise and well-intentioned teachers against deliberate corruption of the young. But they are not at all the same thing: innocence which is the product of ignorance has no moral worth—it only becomes of value for moral growth in association with knowledge. The writer is suggesting that with the acquisition of sexual knowledge something precious has been lost; on the contrary, nothing but ignorance has been lost—and that is always well lost—while something very precious has been found: the opportunity to use that sexual knowledge well.

The proper approach to the "sexual problem" at a coeducational school involves several things. First, a minimum of definite sex stimulation (this policy must not be confused with active suppression, which is always wrong) in the form of certain foods and

[1] *Progressive Schools* reviewed in the *Preparatory Schools Review* of June 1934.

drinks, erotic films and literature, cosmetics, and particularly the nasty stuff which sexually jaded adults regard as suitable music for dancing. There is a right and a wrong form for sexuality to assume at school: the right one is affectionate understanding, the wrong one is an aping of adult behaviour. Secondly, there should be those active helps towards sexual control which are furnished by free and comfortable clothing, colour and freshness in the everyday physical surroundings of the school, the enjoyment of a great deal of open air life, and the practice of the arts, particularly music and dramatics. In all these things sexuality may healthily be expressed. Thirdly, there must be no disapproval, spoken or unspoken, of the sexual nature of children as such. It should be unnecessary to have to mention such a point, but there are still people who transfer their own disappointment with themselves to children in this way. All sexual insinuations concerning friendships are wrong; direct discussion is quite another thing, and may be extremely valuable. It is wrong to suggest that friendships are "silly"; it is equally wrong to convey the idea that they are fraught with tremendous significance; it is right to regard them as natural—as indeed they are. Fourthly, there should be full and timely sex instruction, given to boys and girls in each others' presence (healthy children prefer it done in this way). This should be physiological, psychological—not psychoanalytical, of course, but dealing with sex in aspects other than the purely physical, especially its relation

to the whole personality—and social. By social sex instruction is understood such topics as marriage, prostitution, abortion and birth control, and about these things questions should be able to be put, and accurate answers given. Physiological instruction should be given to all children capable of understanding the function of the sexual organs in their biological setting, psychological instruction to those who are a little older, and social instruction to those who are in their last year or two at school. This programme may shock some adults, but it will not shock children; they will be all the better for the information, and—what is more important—all the stronger for it. (They will do their best, anyway, to discover all they can about all the questions referred to; so they might as well learn the truth, unemotionally, from somebody whose business it is to know it, instead of getting half-truths, piecemeal, in the variety of emotionally objectionable ways that are open to the curious minded.)

The above are some of the chief prerequisites for the healthy and gradual growth of the sexual natures of children. Those people who suppose that the logical conclusion of coeducation is companionate marriage at school, have insufficient knowledge of what normal adolescent nature is actually like. (Seriously abnormal sexual cases are best not dealt with at schools at all.) In our particular climate, with our particular school traditions, and with wise hygienic and dietetic regimen, not only are English children not being subjected to an unfair temptation

to seek complete sexual consummation with each other, but such consummation is not, to them, a desired part of their relationship. It belongs to maturity, and they are not, neither do they feel, mature. In rare instances it will be necessary to put before certain couples the case for abstention from sexual intercourse during adolescence; and although in a good school these instances are very rare indeed, they ought in all honesty to be considered. The case for abstention is a perfectly good one, based on spiritual, aesthetic, psychological, economic and common-sense considerations which all intelligent girls and boys are capable of appreciating; their enumeration would fill a separate chapter, but it should hardly be necessary to set them out in detail here. It is unnecessary, as well as wrong, to put fears into children concerning this matter; sexual self-control based on fear is worse than licence, but if it is based on knowledge and reverence for personality, it is at the very core of healthy growth. Self-control is not the same as repression; in life, as in art, it is only through control that perfect freedom can be attained. If it were the case that every effort at self-control involved a repression, then the sooner the doors of all schools were closed, the better. Children will not readily accept adult experience in the matter of sexual control—they tend to suspect insincerity, and they may sometimes be right; but they will accept reason, and look upon the safe-guards which reason suggests, as supports and not arbitrary restrictions of liberty.

The attitude of the adults at a school, it goes without saying, is of decisive importance in relation to sex. Their own fears and hatreds will, whether they like it or no, be visited upon the children; their behaviour to one another will influence the children more profoundly than they are apt to realize. Those who suffer from strong feelings either of superiority or of inferiority in respect of sex are badly out of place in a coeducational school; neither a too determined feminist nor a violent anti-feminist is a good sexual influence upon the young. The essential thing is that the adults should not be anxiety-ridden where the sexual lives of the children are concerned; their anxiety will be conveyed instantly to the children, whose sexual consciousness will become anxious or aggressive as a result. The less they put children sexually "on their honour," the better; adults who regard a kiss at school as a breach of trust, would be more suitably employed in some other profession. Their chief concern should be not to departmentalize sex, but to regard it—as it is rightly to be regarded—as one expression of a rich and varied human nature.

A word might profitably be said here about the question of what is curiously called being "nude" (curiously, because nude is a legal adjective properly used to describe statements not formally attested, and was first perverted by Ouida and others in the 'seventies of last century to describe naked bodies). It may be fortunate that this rather squeamish term exists to describe a special cult of undressing; it is

entirely unfortunate that so many of the magazines devoted to the cult should be apparently designed for a public interested less in being naked, than in seeing what other people look like naked, as pictured in " art supplements " and the like. The remaining contents of the shops where such magazines are sold are seldom a good advertisement for the healthiness of the cult itself; and the Tuke-like reticence of the pictures—the law, of course, demands either an " accidental " veiling or a blurring of the genitals—causes the whole thing to wear a certain air of absurdity. It would be a helpful feature of coeducation if occasional nakedness could be regarded as normal and unexciting; children would—in fact, do—regard it in this way, but it apparently excites the public so much that no school dare take the risk of publicly advocating, for instance, naked bathing of boys and girls together. Bathing (or, very occasionally in our climate, sun bathing) provides the only reasonable occasions for nakedness, for the good reason that it is very much pleasanter if it is enjoyed naked; the self-conscious taking off of one's clothes at all sorts of odd times, sometimes advocated by the nudity cults, is certainly no part of a good education. But since public opinion does matter economically, schools must wait for it to change on this matter. It is a wholly healthy curiosity that prompts any girl or boy to wish (as every reader of these words has at one time or another wished) to see the other sex naked, at any rate once; but they will have to be patient, and realize that a large number of people

have dirty minds on the subject, and have spread their hatred of sex to cover quite large portions of their bodies. Meanwhile, sensible children will continue to make opportunities, apart from adult fuss, to enjoy occasional nakedness. Those who are quite certain that nakedness is objectionable might start considering, with some care, on what grounds they do so; the results of their reflections may surprise them.

CHAPTER XII

COEDUCATION IN THE NEW SCHOOL

It was stated at the beginning of chapter VIII that those who have done the most important pioneer coeducational work have, in the main, been believers in what is known as " progressive education "; and, largely for this reason, a sketch of the rise of the New School was considered a necessary part of a historical account of coeducation, although in point of fact the majority of the earlier New Schools, at any rate, were segregated. Coeducation, rightly regarded, is only one feature of a general approach to education; it is impossible to evaluate *in vacuo*, for it is a single expression of a certain way of life. Various other features of the New Education can, of course, be present in segregated schools; and there are many such schools which have far more in common with the pioneer coeducational schools than with the traditional system. But these features find their truest expression where both sexes are being brought up together, for they are all of them based, fundamentally, on reverence for personality; and personality means woman as well as man. Coeducation by itself is no educational panacea; a bad coeducational school is as bad as any

other kind of school. It has proved most successful in association with "progressive" principles, which it will be the business of this chapter to consider.

If such principles are to be summed up in a single phrase, it would certainly be this "reverence for personality" which is, perhaps, the expression of a religious attitude to life. (To indicate the scope of the word "religious" in this sense, there is an eloquent passage in Bertrand Russell's *Principles of Social Reconstruction* which pleads for this reverence towards the child, very finely and satisfyingly.) It involves the conception of the child as an organic whole; and both words are significant. Coeducation should give training of life, for life, by life: that is, it should train the child regarded as a complete form of life in itself, with its own impulses, interests, faculties, emotions and will to do good; it should prepare it for creative living, not for unquestioning obedience or automatic response to social stimulus; and it should do this not by regarding the child as so much material to be moulded, or given the "stamp" of a particular school, but by providing the best possible conditions for healthy growth and trusting in life itself to do the rest. This involves community living, for the good individual is not a Homunculus created in Paracelsus' phial, a bare entelechy existing outside all life experience, however richly endowed he may be: he is something created by and through experience, and can best realize the possibilities of his nature in association

with others. And the community should resemble less a greenhouse than a countryside: coeducation succeeds best—perhaps it can only succeed—in an atmosphere of freedom, spontaneous activity and awareness of beauty. In segregated schools there are different standards for the two sexes in matters of everyday etiquette, and even of ethics: thus, to take a trivial example, a boy may get dirty but he may not cry, and a girl may cry but should not get dirty; it is part of the business of coeducation to find a common standard, in which the two sexes shall understand and honour each other. It cannot be too much emphasized that the need is not to abolish sex differences, but actually to preserve them, in the sense of harmonizing and adjusting them; the aim of coeducation is to train men and women, not Urnings.

It is important that schools should be staffed by people who believe in what they are doing; not only should they be without strong feelings of sex superiority, but they must love—that is, approve of—children, and not teaching only. Coeducation requires the living together of children and adults on more informal terms than orthodox education is accustomed to, or even regards as proper; only in this way will the older people be able to advise satisfactorily upon the problems which the younger people need to bring, and do bring, to them for help. This approval excludes favouritism, which, as Badley wisely says, is "bad at any time, and destructive of influence with the rest, still more if it

seems to attach to the other sex, and most of all if to a single individual." [1]

It is important that the mingling of the sexes should not be half-hearted; the worst kind of "coeducational" school is one which plays at the business, and secretly disapproves of it the whole time—unless the "dual" school is worse still, where separate girl and boy departments exist in the same building, but under different heads, with different entrances, classrooms and playgrounds. This is not education, but tantalization. Coeducation means, at the very least, the instruction and training of the two sexes in the same school, in the same classes, and mostly in the same courses of study, throughout the years of growth; beyond this, it is important to what extent men and women are mixed on the teaching staff, and to what extent the children really share the same life, not only in class but in all the normal social activities of the school. There are "coeducational" schools where the two sexes may not be seen walking to and from school together, on penalty of punishment. There is one boarding school where a girl may not go alone with a boy for a Saturday or Sunday afternoon walk—the expedition is considered respectable only if at least two boys and two girls are present. Fortunately, intelligent children can easily work out the simple mathematical problem involved, if they want to achieve solitary couples, and in practice the foursome splits in half as soon as it is

[1] J. H. Badley: *Notes and suggestions for those who join the Staff of Bedales School* (Cambridge), 1922.

out of sight of the school buildings. As a chaperoning device this method is the failure that it deserves to be; as a piece of training in the right relationship between the sexes, it is mischievous in the extreme. At another school the buildings for boys and girls respectively are quite separate; the two sexes catch sight of each other round corners, and may even get to know each other through their families; but they are never allowed to meet informally as equals. At yet another "coeducational" school, a short while ago, mixed bathing was an excitement reserved for one day a year—and what an excitement it must have been! If there is anything more foolish than this fear of the sexes meeting in a human way, it is the practice of one school, which until lately enforced their meeting at mealtimes, by requiring them to sit boy and girl alternately; the system simply became, as an ex-pupil put it, a "vast flirting machine." Such abuses of coeducation are the more deplorable because most of the instances quoted occurred in boarding schools. The English coeducational boarding school, at its best, is practising the completest form of coeducation in the world; and if coeducation is a wise method of upbringing, it is presumably more important in a boarding than in a day school; segregation cannot do so much positive harm in the latter as semi-segregation can in the former. In a boarding school, it is essential that coeducation should begin as young as possible; most coeducational schools know the difficult sexual problem presented by the boy from a segregated public

school, who comes to coeducation well advanced in adolescence. And the width of age range, too, is a matter of importance; as J. H. Wicksteed observes,[1] in a school where there are no boys older than ten, the boys of ten are treated like boys of fifteen or sixteen, and try to behave like them; and in a school where there are none less than ten, they are regarded as babies or small animals, which they proceed to emulate. The false air of maturity in the gruff-voiced and moustached, but gauche and unco-ordinated boy product of many a segregated school, is a painful thing to see; his school has simply stolen some years of childhood from him.

Allowing the mixing of the sexes must never be confused with enforcing it. We have seen that there are certain fairly well-marked stages in the lives of most normal children, in the extent to which they wish to join with the other sex. In the pre-adolescent years, up to twelve, there is probably a complete social mixing, and no sex difference discernible. In the early stages of adolescence—earlier, of course, for girls than for boys—there is probably some reserve, and some degree of voluntary segregation for a while; there may even be some distinct sex hostility between twelve and fourteen. This hostility is rooted in a curious mixture of physical attraction allied to moral and intellectual repulsion between the sexes, and it is important that school authorities should not make too much of it. At fifteen or

[1] In the pamphlet already referred to on p. 178 footnote.

sixteen there is likelihood of sentimentality and flirtatiousness, which after sixteen develops into dignity and genuine friendship between the sexes. It is during that difficult transitional year that it is most unwise (though it is unwise at any time) to laugh at adolescent emotions; children instinctively, and quite rightly, feel that their attachments are good and precious, and bitterly resent any condescending or belittling phrase concerning them. To sneer at calf love is very easy, and very foolish; this does not mean that one should make any more portentous a matter which is probably sufficiently solemn already. The co-operation and understanding between the sexes which is the aim of coeducation must never be artificial, or too self-conscious; it is best, for instance, if no school rules refer obviously and specifically to girl-and-boy relationships (though some rules must, admittedly, have regard to them). Coeducated children should never be made to feel that they are carrying out an exciting experiment; emphasis on the point can be harmfully suggestive. The only right kind of association between the sexes is the kind that arises naturally out of boy and girl nature; this, at its best and most vigorous, provides the most satisfying possible kind of school life, and a sexual balance which segregation must always lack. It is paradoxically true that girls have a sexually quietening, as well as a sexually stimulating, influence upon boys. Given the possibility for privacy and withdrawal from the strain of community living, there will be no department of school activities

except games which the two sexes may not fitly share—and even in physical recreation, swimming and tennis are ideally suited to be enjoyed coeducationally. There is no academic subject—certainly not biology—for which any separation on grounds of sex is advisable. The sexes should be able to be together during the whole of the daytime. Sleeping quarters will naturally be separate, but preferably not under separate roofs; where they are under the same roof, they should not be bolted or barricaded against each other, and the sexes should have occasional opportunities of seeing what each others' dormitories look like. The rule that they do not ordinarily go into them should not be based on sinfulness (for it would not be sinful), but presented as a matter of courtesy, as it is properly to be regarded.

With the belief in coeducation usually goes belief in freer academic methods than are common in orthodox schools. The aim is that there should be less teaching, and more learning: more "self-activity" on the part of the child. There is a good deal of misunderstanding about the academic position of many "modern" schools: they are sometimes thought not to pay much attention to intellectual training of the good old kind. But a "modern" school is not simply one that has given up Greek—that, in itself, would be entirely a pity; it is one which believes that it is quite essential, for the whole development of children, for them to have a curriculum based on manual as well as mental

work—where possible, the two being intimately combined. It is deplorable that the only opportunities for the exercise of bodily skill at a school should be through conventional ball games. The New School realizes that academic demands must wait upon the physical and psychological growth of the child, and it frankly recognizes that there are years when a healthy child should not be interested in book learning. (These are usually the years when preparatory schoolboys are doing their final spurt before a scholarship examination.) It believes in the value of hard work, but it looks with a little suspicion upon the view that what is unpleasant is always educationally correct. The time has been when Latin, for instance, was supported by many teachers simply because of its dullness; if a duller subject could be found, they would instantly clamour for it to supersede Latin. (T. H. Huxley once threatened to compile an osteological primer "so arid, so pedantic in its terminology, so altogether distasteful to the youthful mind," that it would put the Latin teachers out of business.[1]) The New School takes learning seriously, in that it does not make a foolish competitive game of it. Competition in class does not work, and even if it did work it would still not be good education; the proper place to keep mark-books is the waste-paper basket—the information they contain is as valueless as its form is repulsive, to anybody whose real aim is to pursue knowledge,

[1] Quoted in W. B. Curry: *The School* (Bodley Head), 1934, to which I am indebted for several acute observations.

helping and helped by others. (So many teachers say they would like to dispense with marks, but so few actually do.) There is no good reason why a child should be interested in the academic success or failure of anyone except himself; there is a bad reason, which is present when the failure of others is the condition of his own success—a morally deplorable position, since learning should be the pursuit of a common aim. Those who preach co-operation at school in games and social life generally, and make the single exception of cut-throat competition in the sphere where it is least necessary, are simply creating a moral muddle for their pupils. The mark system is bad for the unsuccessful child, whom it depresses, and possibly worse for the successful, who assumes credit not for achieving a certain standard, but for defeating his competitors. Prizes are given, inevitably, not to the child who has done his best (nobody can tell who that is) but to the one who does enough to keep ahead of his fellows; a prize takes no account of—it even discourages—the notion that superior talent should be responsible for making a greater contribution to the common attainment. Left to themselves, children do not want the mark system; it is teachers who persuade them into wanting it. Marks certainly provide an incentive of a kind: there is a certain appeal to "mark-grubbing," which is a manifestation of the collecting instinct. But they quite deliberately appeal to children to adopt dishonest methods in order to obtain good places in class; and in schools cursed with a strong competitive

spirit the ethical standards of the classroom can be appallingly low.[1]

Co-operation is, in general, the moral aim of the New Education, as competition is of orthodox schools. These latter often make a bold show of inculcating toleration, individuality, a pacific outlook and a spirit of internationalism—and then utterly vitiate these good intentions by supporting an O.T.C., which is direct training in the negation of all these things.[2] The best of democratic and peaceful teaching which still survives in many orthodox schools will have no influence upon young people, so long as the conduct of their everyday lives is based upon autocracy and a warlike spirit. It is no good preaching one set of precepts for twenty minutes during the Sunday evening chapel service, so long as an opposite set is practised during most of the remaining six days of the week. A New School accepts not only the principle of democracy, but its implications in school life; and these are very considerable. They mean a great deal of personal liberty, in thought and speech and action; they mean the end of the prefect system and personal fagging, and the adoption of a large measure of real self-government by the children—so that they may, not by mere acquiescence, but consciously with their wills, through open discussion and majority legislation,

[1] This point of view is excellently defended in J. H. Simpson: *An Adventure in Education* (Sidgwick & Jackson), 1919.

[2] For a full discussion of this, see L. B. Pekin: *The Military Training of Youth: an enquiry into the aims and effects of the O.T.C.* (Hogarth Press), 1937.

control important aspects of their school lives. They mean a resolute attempt to abolish class divisions and the false distinction between truly honourable and "merely manual" work: thus, children will do much of their housework, sweep and tidy classrooms, and wash up their own meals, not in order to save domestic help, but so as to appreciate the fact that the necessary division of labour in a community is a question of time and not of social status.

Finally, a matter in which the New School's policy differs *toto caelo* from that of the old, is that of punishment. It is difficult to live for many years in a decently conducted school, and still have much belief in punishment left. Most punishments are invented by older people to give themselves an easy time; hardly any of the things for which children are normally punished are morally wrong, and when they are morally wrong, punishment is hardly ever the right way to help the child. Certain checks—and very definite, clearly understood, and unemotional checks they need to be—are always necessary for the smooth running of a school community; they are inherent in the very nature of social life. But at school they should, so far as is humanly possible, take the form of purely automatic consequences, such as the doing of things left undone, and the remedying by the doer of things ill done. The system of punishments in a school tells one, at a glance, most of what one needs to know about the school; a bad teacher is helpless without a system of

elaborate rules and penalties, a good one is almost equally helpless with them. Punishment which takes the form of physical violence is always wrong; and it is on corporal punishment that orthodox education invariably relies. There are schools which persist in it, even today, with a determination that would, in the service of some better cause, be worthy of high praise; in the cause of brutality it is more than a trifle disgusting. They persist in it, in the face of the unanimous testimony of psychology. Almost all the accepted great educationists from Plato onwards have written against it, and have long ago converted everyone except these schoolmasters who are so certain they know better. All enlightened States have removed corporal punishment from their penal codes; even in our own country, responsible authorities have lately recommended its complete abolition in the treatment of young offenders by courts of summary jurisdiction, and by order of superior courts.[1] So little did this Committee represent " crank " opinion that they went through almost ludicrous contortions in disclaiming all sympathy with progressive ideas on the subject. At the International Congress on Penology in 1924, the solitary authority who defended beating, even for criminals, owned that the punishment was so undesirable for those who inflicted it that the victim should be beaten by a machine. Are orthodox teachers really so frightened of the consequences of

[1] *Report of the Departmental Committee on Corporal Punishment* (H.M. Stationery Office), 1938.

abolishing the rule of violence at school, that they must obstinately persist in retaining this instrument of the brothel in their prefects' studies ? Of course the cane saves time: it short-circuits all attempts at understanding an offender or an offence, and effectually removes all necessity for thought in either the beaten or the beater. It saves the beater some trouble, revenges his outraged authority, allows him to air his righteous indignation, panders to his sense of power, and satisfies his lust. But none of these things is very good for the beater. And how the culprit should be improved by having the flesh of his buttocks painfully bruised, is not altogether clear. Perhaps the oddest thing of all in this affair is the sheer ignorance among some supporters of beating, of its sexual connotations; these are better understood, and more thoroughly appreciated, among the perverts who manage the Nazi concentration camps. The scarcely disguised sexual approach of some schoolmasters to the deed is often blatantly obvious to everyone except themselves. A good authority, who was for fifteen years a housemaster at Harrow, and had wide experience also at Reformatory and Borstal institutions,[1] said he had " known many boys whose first introduction to masturbation, at far too early an age, was affected by the excitatory result of a stick applied to his naked body." Yet it is precisely sexual offences which are most often punished in this

[1] D. B. Kittermaster in an article entitled *The Cane and the Cat*, published in *The Spectator* of January 20th, 1939; it provoked the usual naive correspondence.

way; stupid schoolmasters encourage the very offences which they profess to deplore, and thus, year after year in our respectable schools, the sexual instincts of boys are warped and licensed sadism masquerades as "discipline." Anyone who has heard the talk of over-sexed seniors at school finding excuses for thrashing their handsome little friends, or has listened to the muddle-headed defence of that form of bullying put up by teachers who are afraid to dispense with it, or by adult products (if it is not stretching the meaning of the adjective too far) of orthodox education who pathetically fancy that it has made them manly, can only conclude with Kittermaster that "the general effect of caning at public schools is to dry up the springs of rational thinking."

Of all forms of education, coeducation must most decisively renounce physical violence if it is to have any value at all. Its whole case rests upon a belief in personality, which violence denies. This belief is denied today in an increasing number of societies all over the world; but education can still do something to keep it alive, if its belief is passionate enough. Coeducation does believe passionately in the absolute worth of personality. It is not an accident that throughout the territories of Germany, Italy and Japan the State does not permit the common upbringing of the sexes. Coeducation believes in sex equality, which means equality of status, not necessarily equality of achievement. It believes in values that are rapidly becoming obsolete as the

totalitarian tide advances, but yet need not die: kindness, intellectual integrity, sensitiveness to beauty, moral courage. Orthodox education does indeed encourage physical courage in a rough and ready sort of way, but moral courage is too often atrophied by its manner of living. If a child is to grow to full moral stature, it must live the moral life fully throughout its education; and this means education through community. Right education needs right surroundings, of which the most important is the human element. Virtue, as Aristotle said, is a matter primarily of social relationships; and these involve the sharing by the sexes of a common school life. The two sexes need each other, spiritually as well as physically; and an upbringing that separates girl and boy during almost the whole period of their growth is subjecting them to a serious deprivation. How can it be expected that, thus separated in their early years and denied real knowledge of each other, they will suddenly be capable of combining to form a harmonious society upon reaching maturity? Life in a coeducational school is difficult in many ways; but its difficulties are not those upon which critics most love to fasten—they are the difficulties always present in a meeting-ground of very varied personalities. Such a school is little tied to routine, but rather creates its life freshly at each new stage of its development; its method is, necessarily, to a large extent empirical, and therein lies its adventurous quality and its appeal to the best in the teachers who practise it.

Where regularity is made an end in itself, human character deteriorates; Darwin quotes[1] a wise physician who once told him that " persons who are slightly imbecile tend to act in everything by routine and habit, and they are rendered much happier if this is encouraged." A certain amount of improvization at school has an extraordinarily tonic effect upon those whose characters are not altogether scleroid, provided that it takes the form of variations upon a known and trusted theme. On the whole it may be said that coeducation furnishes greater opportunities than any other form of upbringing, both for good and evil. The whole life of personal relationships has an immensely increased importance where the sexes are together; and the scope of interests, in children and adults alike, is correspondingly widened. Even the Committee who reported on the Differentiation of Curricula found that to teach boys and girls together required " a wider outlook on life "—a remarkable implied criticism of conventional education.

This chapter was to have ended with a series of testimonies by coeducated young people who had left school, concerning their upbringing; but as they were collected, they proved to be so alike in their general outlines that their extended recital would have been pointless. It will suffice to take a single example from each sex. A characteristic boy's testimony is to the effect that youths from segregated schools are quite incapable of judging girls except

[1] In *The Descent of Man.*

in a dangerously superficial way. He finds no diminution, in a coeducational school, of the best elements in boy and boy friendships, and a complete absence of abnormal relationships inside one sex. He finds the talk there cleaner, and bullying very rare. He entirely disagrees that boys are softened by the presence of girls, and believes that coeducation encourages the proper development of sexual character differences on both sides. He says that the business of school is to fit one for life, not simply for a job, and for this purpose an understanding between the sexes is essential. A characteristic girl's testimony is to the effect that women and men need to know each other better than ever before, now that they are working together in nearly all spheres of life; in order to do this they need to grow up together. She finds coeducated girls more at ease than others, and free from unfortunate "crushes" on their elders; she was glad to be free of the emotional atmosphere of a segregated girls' school, with its ever-changing friendships and its prevalence of petty gossip. Having teachers of both sexes gave her stability, concentration and a broader outlook than she could otherwise have obtained. Boys played, to some extent, the valuable role of brothers in a family, giving candid criticism and stimulus; she found them less tolerant of small ficklenesses and petty intrigues than girls. She does not believe that girls brought up with boys are apt to grow "tough"; on the contrary, she finds that it is instinctive for them to make themselves more feminine in order to

be attractive. She believes that a coeducated woman will work for women's rights with no feeling of sex antagonism, and feels that her upbringing has taught her the value of co-operation and increased her capacity for friendship.

We may end where we began. Perhaps we have not found an answer to Plato's question; but we have found that a gradually increasing number of people are coming to believe that human nature is indivisible and that the separation of the sexes, in education no less than in human society at large, is a denial of the spirit of co-operation which alone makes the good life possible. Those who believe in the essentially social nature of all human morality and improvement, must hold that to be intellectually wise alone is only half the battle, and the lesser half: the triumph of the seeker after that "love towards a thing eternal and infinite" which was for Spinoza the central aim of education—expressed in what is perhaps the noblest conception of it that has ever been uttered—is to find for his fellow-men as well as for himself. And those who are working towards this end through the common upbringing of boys and girls will not be dismayed at the slow progress that their ideal is making, in winning the allegiance of mankind at large; for "all things excellent are as difficult as they are rare."

APPENDIX I

SOME PRIVATE COEDUCATIONAL SCHOOLS

THERE follows some information about twenty-three schools, all of which may be said to carry on something of the pioneer tradition of coeducation in this country: that is to say, they are all independently controlled, and in varying degrees " modern " and progressive in policy. (How varied, the prospectuses obtainable from them severally will show.) An asterisk marks the Friends' Schools, which, it should be noted, accept children quite unconnected with their Society. Only schools which educate children well into adolescence have been included in this list. The columns show, respectively, the title and address of the school; the ages for which it caters; whether it is for boarders or day children; the total number of children of either sex; and the total number of children altogether over fourteen years of age.

Bedales School, Petersfield, Hants	4–19	B. & D.	83 g. 72 b.	107
Beltane School, Queensmere Road, Wimbledon Common, S.W.19	5–18	B. & D.	117 b. 114 g.	59
Dartington Hall, Totnes, S. Devon	2–18	B. & D.	109 g. 92 b.	58
Greater Felcourt, East Grinstead, Sussex	10–18	B. & D.	24 b. 22 g.	6

Forest School, Whitwell Hall, Reepham, Norfolk ..	3–18	B.	13 b. 9 g.	4
Frensham Heights, Rowledge, Farnham, Surrey	3–19	B. & D.	76 g. 65 b.	62
*Great Ayton, Friends' School, Yorkshire	9–17	B. & D.	104 b. 69 g.	100
Hampden School, 14 Holland Park, W.11	2–17	D.	29 b. 19 g.	0
Herrlingen School, Otterden, Faversham, Kent	6–18	B. & D.	82 b. 64 g.	71
Keswick School, Derwentwater, Cumberland ..	5–19	B. & D.	139 g. 138 b.	129
King Alfred School, Manor Wood, North End Road, N.W.11	3–18	D.	111 g. 104 b.	52
Kingsmoor School, Glossop, Derbyshire	6–18	B.	40 g. 34 b.	36
Long Dene School, Jordans, Beaconsfield, Bucks ..	3–16	B. & D.	14 g. 12 b.	1
Michael Hall, 93 Leigham Court Road, S.W.16 ..	4–18	B. & D.	121 b. 115 g.	60
*Saffron Walden, Friends' School, Essex	7–18	B. & D.	122 g. 116 b.	101
St. Christopher School, Letchworth, Herts	3–19	B. & D.	122 b. 119 g.	92
St. George's School, Harpenden, Herts	3–19	B. & D.	125 b. 125 g.	109
St. Mary's, 16 Wedderburn Road, N.W.3	3–17	B. & D.	117 g. 115 b.	78
Sherrardswood, Welwyn Garden City, Herts	5–18	D.	83 g. 64 b.	30
*Sibford School, Banbury, Oxon	10–17	B. & D.	86 g. 74 b.	65
*Sidcot School, Winscombe, Somerset	10–18	B. & D.	92 g. 90 b.	96
Summerhill, Leiston, Suffolk	3½–18	B.	37 b. 31 g.	12
*Wigtown, Friends' School, Cumberland	7–17	B. & D.	64 b. 45 g.	38

APPENDIX II

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For specific points, reference has been made to sources by means of footnotes during the course of this book. Its debt to some other books, listed below, is more general and more considerable. The German literature of coeducation is almost illimitable; of many such books it may be said that the best thing about them is their titles, and it would be profitless to refer the reader to such works as Cohn and Dieffenbacher's *Untersuchungen über Geschlechts-, Alters-, und Begabungsunterschiede bei Schülern*, Meumann's *Thesen zur psychologischen Grundlegung des Problems der Koedukation und der Koinstruktion*, or Zanck's *Warum und wieweit bedingt der Geschlechtsunterschied der Schüler eine Differenzierung der Lehr- und Stoffpläne für Knaben und Mädchenvolksschulen.*

Alice Woods, ed.: *Coeducation, a series of essays by different authors* (Longmans, Green), 1903.

E. Curtis: *An Uppingham for Boys and Girls* (Alden, Oxford), 1906.

Vivian Grey and Edwin S. Tylee: *Boy and Girl, should they be educated together?* (Simpkin Marshall), 1906.

J. H. Badley: *Coeducation* (privately printed pamphlet), 1911.
S. Poirson: *La coéducation, ses causes, ses effets, son avenir* (Paris), 1911.
Cecil Grant and Norman Hodgson: *The Case for Coeducation* (Grant Richards), 1913.
J. H. Badley: *Coeducation in practice* (Heffer), 1914.
Giovanni Calò: *Il problema della coeducazione* (Milano), 1914.
Alice Woods, ed.: *Advance in Coeducation* (Sidgwick & Jackson), 1919.
J. H. Badley: *Coeducation and its part in a complete education* (Heffer), 1929.
J. H. Badley: *Bedales, a pioneer school* (Methuen), 1923.
Hanna von Pestalozza: *Der Streit um die Koedukation in den letzten dreissig Jahren in Deutschland* (Sachsen), 1923.
B. L. Gimson: *Problems in Coeducation* (New Education Fellowship pamphlet), 1927.
B. A. Howard: *The Mixed School, a study of Coeducation* (Chapman & Hall), 1928.
Gustav Wyneken: *Koedukation und Sexualerziehung* from *Schule und Jugendkultur* (Jena), 1928.
Joseph Schröteler: *Geschlechtermischung oder Geschlechtertrennung, Beitrage zum Koedukationsproblem* (Düsseldorf), 1933.
Arnold Lloyd: *The Years between, an enquiry into the bases of coeducation for adolescents* (manuscript).
G. Crump: *Bedales since the War* (Chapman & Hall), 1936.

ALLAMA IQBAL LIBRARY
954

ALLAMA
IQBAL LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF KASHMIR
HELP TO KEEP THIS BOOK
FRESH AND CLEAN